

## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/204316>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2020-01-02 and may be subject to change.

## Microplastics in coastal areas and seafood: implications for food safety

Inneke Hantoro<sup>a,b</sup>, Ansje J. L  hr<sup>b</sup>, Frank G. A. J. Van Belleghe<sup>b,c</sup>, Budi Widianarko<sup>a</sup> and Ad M. J. Ragas<sup>b,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Faculty of Agricultural Technology, Department of Food Technology, Soegijapranata Catholic University, Semarang, Indonesia; <sup>b</sup>Faculty of Management, Science & Technology, Department of Science, Open University of the Netherlands, Heerlen, The Netherlands; <sup>c</sup>Centre for Environmental Sciences, Department of Biology, Hasselt University, Hasselt, Belgium; <sup>d</sup>Institute of Water and Wetland Research, Department of Environmental Science, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

### ABSTRACT

Microplastics have become ubiquitous in the marine environment. Microplastics have been detected in many coastal environments and species, including commercial seafood. This triggers concern about potential economic impacts and the risks of dietary exposure, especially for coastal communities. However, data regarding the levels of microplastics in coastal seafood and their toxicological effects are still limited. Accordingly, the dietary risk is still poorly explored. This review summarizes and discusses recent scientific findings on (i) the presence of microplastics in coastal waters, (ii) the occurrence of microplastics in coastal seafood and the likelihood of trophic transfer, and (iii) the effects of microplastics on coastal fish and shellfish species. Human toxicity data are also reviewed, but the risks for human health are difficult to determine due to limited data. Based on available worldwide data, the estimation of microplastics intake through seafood consumption shows a huge variation. Additionally, a lack of standardized analytical methods complicates the comparison of results between studies and therefore seriously affects the reliability of risk assessments. It is concluded that more exposure and toxicity data are needed properly to assess human health risks of microplastics in coastal seafood, and the lack of data currently impede the derivation of a risk-based food safety standard. The pros and cons of an interim solution, i.e. setting a provisional action level, are being discussed.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 27 December 2018  
Accepted 17 February 2019

### KEYWORDS

Microplastics; coastal seafood species; trophic transfer; food safety



## Introduction

After the introduction of plastics in the 1950s, their intensive use and poor waste management have led to a widespread dispersal of plastics in the marine environment (Jambeck et al. 2015). The growing presence of plastic pollution has triggered serious concerns about the implications for marine ecosystems, the ecosystem services provided, and human health (GESAMP 2016). The pollution expands from shorelines to the open ocean and the deep seas (Bouwmeester et al. 2015; GESAMP 2016).

It has been estimated that 4.8–12.7 million tons of plastic waste ended up in the ocean in 2010 (Jambeck et al. 2015). The broad range in plastic marine debris estimations is caused by the variation in population size and the quality of waste management systems in the 192 coastal countries targeted in the study (Jambeck et al. 2015). The pollution originates from both terrestrial and aquatic sources. The litter from

terrestrial sources usually originates from urban areas, tourism and river outflows, whereas marine debris originates from ships or abandoned, lost, or otherwise discarded fishing gear, and will typically be deposited along the shore when entrapped in near-shore currents (Ryan et al. 2009). Another study estimated that between 1.15–2.41 million tonnes of plastic waste enters the ocean every year from rivers (Lebreton et al. 2017).

Although plastics are generally persistent and durable, photo-oxidative degradation caused by prolonged exposure to ultraviolet (UV) radiation and physical abrasion can fragment plastic debris into smaller particles in the micrometer to nanometer range (Andr  dy 2011). Although there is no generally accepted definition of microplastics, they are commonly referred to as plastic particles with a size smaller than 5 mm (Law and Thompson 2014). In this review, we consider microplastics to be in the size range

**CONTACT** Inneke Hantoro  [inneke.hantoro@ou.nl](mailto:inneke.hantoro@ou.nl)  Faculty of Agricultural Technology, Department of Food Technology, Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia

 Supplemental data for this article can be accessed on the [publisher's website](#).

   2019 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

1  $\mu\text{m}$  to 5 mm as proposed by Frias and Nash (2019).

Distinction is made between primary and secondary sources of microplastics (Cole et al. 2011; GESAMP 2016; Boucher and Friot 2017). Primary sources are direct emissions of 'primary' microplastics by industrial processes and domestic uses. Primary microplastics are manufactured in a micro-size range, such as pellets, powder plastics (GESAMP 2016) and microbeads in cosmetics (Cole et al. 2011; GESAMP 2016). Primary microplastics also can be derived from the abrasion of large plastic objects during manufacturing, use or maintenance, e.g. the microfibrils resulting from the abrasion of synthetic textile during washing (Boucher and Friot 2017; Carr 2017). Secondary sources of microplastics are the result of fragmentation and degradation of macroplastics exposed to UV and/or physical abrasion in the environment (GESAMP 2016; Boucher and Friot 2017).

Microplastics show a huge variation in physical and chemical characteristics such as size, composition, weight, shape and colour (Hidalgo-Ruz et al. 2012). These characteristics influence the behaviour of the particles, e.g. their dispersion in the marine environment, adsorption and absorption of contaminants, microbial colonization, potential bioavailability and toxicity (Lambert et al. 2017; Potthoff et al. 2017). For example, low density particles floating on the surface are more prone to advective transport than sinking high density particles. Likewise, spheres may be more likely to be absorbed by organisms than fibres (Au et al. 2015), while irregularly shaped microplastics can sorb less persistent organic pollutants such as phenanthrene, but have a longer gut residence time in *Daphnia magna* (Frydkjær et al. 2017). Furthermore, irregularly shaped microplastics are likely to cause different physiological and biochemical responses in fish compared to spherical microplastics (Choi et al. 2018).

Several studies have reported a high abundance of microplastics in densely populated coastal areas (Lebreton et al. 2017; Ling et al. 2017). Coastal areas are typically located close to densely populated areas and human activities (Browne et al. 2011; Reisser et al. 2013).

The presence of microplastics near the coast is influenced by physical and chemical processes, including the transport of plastics by current and

wind, as well as degradation by weathering (Fok et al. 2017; Hartmann et al. 2017; Zhang 2017; Yu et al. 2018). Some studies revealed that sandy beaches may act as a temporary or permanent sink for microplastics (Lozoya et al. 2016; Yu et al. 2016). Plastics in beach sediments generally have a long residence time and can be fragmented due to UV irradiation and physical abrasion by waves (Veerasingham et al. 2016). In the ocean, fragmentation is much slower than on the beach because of the lower temperatures, UV intensity and mechanical abrasion (Andrady 2011; Cole et al. 2011).

Coastal areas are an important source of seafood. The harvest of coastal fishes reached 7.5 million tonnes in 2014 (excluding crustaceans and molluscs), constituting approximately 8% of the global marine harvest of fish, crustaceans and molluscs (i.e. 93.4 million tonnes) (FAO 2016a, 2016b). Several exotic and expensive seafood species are cultured in coastal areas, e.g. shrimps and crabs. Based on FAO data, marine and coastal aquaculture produced about 28 million tonnes in 2015, which includes molluscs (65%), crustaceans (28%) and finfish (7%) (FAO 2016b). Oysters, clams and mussels are the main molluscan species, whereas penaeid shrimps are the most important crustaceans (Romeo et al. 2015). These amounts underline the economic importance of coastal fishery and aquaculture.

Microplastics can be transferred from the environment to organisms, and subsequently pass through the food web, i.e. transfer from prey to predator. Ingestion of microplastics has been documented in many seafood species from various places around the world, including fish (Foekema et al. 2013; Lusher et al. 2013; Neves et al. 2015; Rochman et al. 2015; Brate et al. 2016; Naidoo et al. 2016; Tanaka and Takada 2016; Jabeen et al. 2017), bivalves (De Witte et al. 2014; Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen 2014; Rochman et al. 2015; Davidson and Dudas 2016; Santana et al. 2016; Leslie et al. 2017), molluscs and crustaceans (Devriese et al. 2015; Wójcik-Fudalewska et al. 2016). Ingestion can be selective (i.e., intentional feeding on plastic fragments that resemble natural food in size and appearance) or non-selective (i.e., particles randomly ingested as a result of suspension, deposit or filter feeding behaviour) (Bellas et al. 2016; Wesch et al. 2016; Santillo et al. 2017). Several studies have shown that the ingestion of

microplastics can cause histopathological changes (Peda et al. 2016) and may affect growth (Watts et al. 2015), the reproduction system (Rochman et al. 2014), and behaviour (Mattsson et al. 2015; Tosetto et al. 2016) of marine organisms such as fish and crab. Obviously, also humans can be exposed to microplastics through the consumption of seafood. However, the relevance and implications of microplastics exposure for seafood species and human health are still largely unknown (Bouwmeester et al. 2015; Koelmans et al. 2016; Barboza et al. 2018; Smith et al. 2018).

Although many studies on microplastics in coastal areas and seafood species have been conducted, the available information is still fragmentary. The main aim of the current review is to collate this information and to present a state-of-the-art global overview on the occurrence of microplastics in coastal areas and coastal seafood species. A comprehensive search for scientific literature was conducted to identify peer-reviewed original research dealing with the presence of microplastics in coastal areas and in seafood collected from coastal areas. The boundary of the coastal areas was set at roughly 100 km distance from the shoreline (Christian et al. 2005). The data retrieved are discussed within the context of the available knowledge on the effects of microplastics on coastal fish and shellfish species, and human health. We conclude with a discussion on how to deal with microplastics as a novel food contaminant from a food safety perspective.

For the present study, we analysed literature that was available up to August 2018. A comprehensive search was conducted for peer-reviewed original research papers, technical reports and proceedings dealing with the presence of microplastics in coastal regions and in seafood collected from coastal regions. The search strategy was designed to identify scientific literature on microplastics in coastal regions and coastal seafood species, using the following search terms: microplastics, coastal, seafood, analysis, toxicity, toxicokinetics, and human exposure. Literature was retrieved from various databases, i.e. Web of Science, Science Direct, Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), Wiley Online Library, Council of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) Taylor and Francis Journals, and PubMed Central. The eligibility of the literature

obtained was assessed based on the relevance and novelty of the study, and the reputation of the journal (i.e. the impact factor >1). There were 323 peer-reviewed papers identified through database searching and 166 articles were selected to be used in this review. Both qualitative and quantitative information of the collected data was grouped into one of the following categories: (1) microplastics in coastal regions, (2) microplastics in coastal seafood and trophic transfer, (3) the effects of microplastics on marine species. All data including the sampling location, quality assurance implementation during microplastic analysis, the abundance or concentration of microplastics in both water and sediment samples, the number or concentration microplastics particles in seafood samples, and type and the size of plastics were collected. Since this review focuses on coastal seafood, seafood species living in other habitats than coastal areas were excluded. The obtained data on the abundance of microplastics in both sediment and water, as well as on the concentration of microplastics in seafood samples, were normalized, i.e. expressed in a common metric. For toxicity studies, the type of seafood, the type and size of microplastics, the level and duration of exposure, and the toxic effects of the microplastics were extracted and evaluated to assess the impact of microplastics on the organisms, and, where possible, on human health. All raw data extracted from literature were compiled in an Excel spreadsheets (see Supplementary Table S1–S7).

## Microplastics in coastal areas

Microplastics have been analysed in sediments and waters of a wide variety of coastal areas around the globe, i.e. from very remote to densely populated areas (Tables 1 and 2) and as well as in coastal seafood (Tables 3 and 4). The data provide a first global impression of the relative spatial distribution of microplastics. The number of studies on microplastics in Asian countries has increased substantially compared to previous reviews (Barnes et al. 2009; Browne et al. 2011; Avio et al. 2016; Auta et al. 2017). All microplastics levels were normalized by expressing the concentration in similar units, but it should be kept in mind that the wide array of methods used for

**Table 1.** The concentration of microplastics (average or range or median in particles/kg dw) and type of plastics in sediments in coastal areas worldwide.

Location	Concentration (particles/kg dw)	Particle size	Type(s) of plastics detected	Method of microplastics identification	QA	Reference
<b>Asia</b>						
Singapore, coastal mangrove Malaysia, beach	12–62.7 8.58	<20 – >5000 µm 1–30 mm	PA, PE, PP, PVC NR	ATR-FTIR NR	NR	Hazimah et al. (2014) Fauziah et al. (2015)
Taiwan, northern coast	54.8	0.25 – ≥4 mm	ABS, PE, PP, PS	ATR-FTIR and SR-FTIR microscopy	NR	Kunz et al. (2016)
Hong Kong, beach	50.7	0.315 – >5 mm	NR	NR	NR	Cheung et al. (2016)
China, Beibu Gulf, coastline	5,020–8,720	<1 – <5 mm	PE, HDPE, PET, PS	FTIR microscopy	NR	Qiu et al. (2015)
China, north Bohai Sea, beach	102.9–163.3	NR	Alkyd, PE, HDPE, LDPE, PET, PEVA, PP, PS	ATR-FTIR	+	Yu et al. (2016)
South Korea, Soya Island, beach	0.9–4.463	50 – >5,000 µm	PE, PP, PS, EPS, PU	Vacuum FTIR and FTIR microscopy	NR	Kim et al. (2015)
Iran, Khark Island, coast	295–1,085	≤100 – ≥5000 µm	NR	NR	+	Akhbarizadeh et al. (2017b)
Iran, Strait of Hormuz, coastline	(1) – 1,258	>0.025 – <4.75 mm (diameter)	PA, PE, PET	FTIR	NR	Naji et al. (2016)
<b>Europe</b>						
Spain, Mallorca Island and Cabrera Island, coast	100.7–897.3	>0.063 – <2mm	NR	NR	+	Alomar et al. (2016)
Portugal, Algarve, coast	10	>1 µm	PP, rayon	FTIR microscopy	+	Frias et al. (2016)
Portugal, western coast, beach	28.9	<1 – >10 mm	PE, PL, PS	FTIR microscopy	NR	Martins and Sobral (2011)
Germany, Baltic Sea, coast	0–7	55 µm – 1 mm	NR	NR	+	Stolte et al. (2015)
Belgium, North Sea, beach	92.8–166.7	38 µm – 1 mm	PA, PE, PP, PS, PVA	FTIR microscopy	NR	Claessens et al. (2011)
Netherlands, North Sea, coast	100–3,600	10–5,000 µm	NR	NR	+	Leslie et al. (2017)
Slovenia, beach	177.8	0.25–5 mm	NR	NR	NR	Laglbauer et al. (2014)
Poland, Baltic Sea, coastline	25 53 0–27	0.1–5 mm	PL PE, PP, PVAc PL	FTIR microscopy	+	Graca et al. (2017)
<b>North America</b>						
Canada, eastern shore of Nova Scotia, beach	2,200–7,400	9–220 µm (median)	NR	NR	+	Mathalon and Hill (2014)
Mexico, Huatulco, beach/sediment (April)	0–4,800	3.0–50 µm (thickness)	NR	SEM	NR	Retama et al. (2016)
(December)	200–6,900	0.0043–4.5 mm (length)				
<b>South America</b>						
Brazil, Guanabara Bay, beach (during summer)	0.15–1.63	NR	PA, PP, PVA, PU, styrofoam	NR	NR	De Carvalho and Neto (2016)
(during winter)	0.04–9.3					
Uruguay, Punta del Este, beach	0.8	0.3 – >100 mm	PE, PET, PP, PS, PVC	Raman microscopy	NR	Lozoya et al. (2016)

ABS: acrylonitrile butadiene styrene, PA: polyamide, PE: polyethylene, HDPE: high density polyethylene, LDPE: low density polyethylene, PET: polyethylene terephthalate, PEVA: polyethylene vinyl acetate, PL: polyester, PP: polypropylene, PS: polystyrene, EPS: expanded polystyrene, PU: polyurethane, PVA: polyvinyl alcohol, PVAc: polyvinyl acetate, PVC: polyvinyl chloride, ATR-FTIR = Attenuated Total Reflection Fourier transform infrared, SR-FTIR = Synchrotron radiation-based Fourier transform infrared, NR = Not Reported, QA = Quality Assurance, + = the study implemented measures to prevent microplastics contamination such as the analysis of blank or spiked samples, cleaning of all equipment and contact materials, and wearing 100% cotton coat during analysis

**Table 2.** The concentration of microplastics and type of plastics in the water column of coastal areas worldwide.

Location	Concentration (particles/m <sup>3</sup> )	Sampling depth	Particle size	Type of polymer(s)	Method of microplastics identification	QA	Reference
<b>Asia</b>							
Indonesia, Cilacap coast	0.27–0.54	Sea surface (20 cm)	< 2.5 – > 5 mm	PET, HDPE, PVC, LDPE, PP, PS, PC	ATR-FTIR	NR	Syakti et al. (2017)
Japan, Seto Inland Sea	0.4	Sea surface (75 cm)	0.1 – >10 mm	PE, PP	FTIR	NR	Isobe et al. (2014)
Japan, Sea of Japan	3.74	Sea surface (75 cm)	0.1 – >10 mm	NR	NR	NR	Isobe et al. (2015)
China, southern estuaries	100–4,100	Sea surface (30 cm)	0.5–5 mm	PE, PP, PTFE, PVC	Raman microscopy	+	Zhao et al. (2015)
South Korea, Incheon/Kyeonggi coastal region	152,688	Surface microlayer (<400 µm)	50–2,000 µm	Paint particles, EPS, PET, PP, PVA, PVC, PVS	FTIR and FTIR microscopy	+	Chae et al. (2015)
	1,602	Sea surface (30 cm)	50–2,000 µm	Paint particles, EPS, PE, PET, PP, PVA, PVC, PVS			
South Korea, Jinhae Bay	12,600	Surface microlayer (150–400 µm)	<50–2,000 µm	Acrylic, paint resin particles, PE, PET, phenoxo resin, PL, PP, PS, PVC, synthetic rubber	FTIR	+	Song et al. (2015)
Hong Kong, coastal regions	0.51–279.9	Surface microlayer (153 µm)	0.03–4.96 mm	HDPE, LDPE, PP, PP – ethylene propylene, SA	ATR-FTIR	NR	Tsang et al. (2016)
<b>Europe</b>							
Portugal, coastal waters	0.002–0.036	Sea surface (20 cm)	>180 – > 325 µm*	Alkyd resin, polyacrylate, PE, PP	FTIR microscopy	NR	Frias et al. (2014)
French, Belgian and Dutch North Sea Coast	400	Sea surface (NR*)	30–300 µm	PS	Raman microscopy	+	Van Cauwenberghe et al. (2015)
Germany, Rostock coast (Warnemünde)	3,300	Sea surface (2–4 cm)	55 µm – 1 mm	NR	NR	+	Stolte et al. (2015)
<b>North America</b>							
Canada, Northern Pacific Ocean and Coastal British Columbia	8–9,200	Sea subsurface (4.5 m)	64.8–5,810 µm	NR	NR	NR	Desforges et al. (2014)
<b>South America</b>							
Brazil, Jurujuba Cove	16.4	Sea surface (20 cm)	< 1 mm – ≥5 mm	PE, PP	ATR-FTIR	NR	Castro et al. (2016)
<b>Africa</b>							
South Africa, south eastern coastline	257.9–1,215	Sea surface (45 cm)	0.080–5 mm	NR	NR	+	Nel and Froneman (2015)
<b>Middle East</b>							
Israel, Mediterranean Coast	7.68	Sea surface (10 cm)	<0.3–5 mm	NR	NR	NR	van der Hal et al. (2017)
<b>Australia</b>							
Coastal waters around Australia	0.007–0.053	Sea surface (0.17 m and 0.3 m)	0.4–82.6 mm	EVA, PE, PP, PS	ATR-FTIR	NR	Reisser et al. (2013)

Surface microlayer: the top of 1000 µm of the sea surface (Unliffe et al. 2013). Sea subsurface: below the surface of the oceans, which is divided into five categories, i.e. epipelagic (from the surface to 200 m), mesopelagic (200–1,000 m), bathypelagic (1,000 m – 4,000 m), abyssopelagic (4,000 m – 6,000 m), and hadalpelagic (>6,000 m) (Akbari et al. 2017). EVA: ethylene vinyl acetate, PC: polycarbonate, PE: polyethylene, HDPE: high density polyethylene, LDPE: low density polyethylene, PET: polyethylene terephthalate, PL: polyester, PP: polypropylene, PS: polystyrene, EPS: expanded polystyrene, PTFE: polytetrafluoroethylene, PVA: polyvinyl alcohol, PVC: polyvinyl chloride, PVS: polyvinyl styrene, SA: styrene acrylonitrile, ATR-FTIR = Attenuated Total Reflection Fourier transform infrared, NR = Not Reported, \* the size of microplastics in this study was based on the mesh size of nets used for collecting the water samples, QA = Quality Assurance, + = the study implemented measures to prevent microplastics contamination such as the analysis of blank samples, cleaning of all equipment and contact materials, and wearing 100% cotton coat during analysis.



Table 3. Summary of available data on microplastics detected in coastal fish species.

Location	Species	Habitat	Tissue	N and # individual ingested MPs (%)	Concentration (#/animal) <sup>1</sup>	Shape(s)	Type of polymer(s)	Identification method	QA	Ref.
<b>Asia</b>										
Indonesia, Poatere Fish Market Makassar	<i>Rastrelliger kanagurta</i> (Indian mackerel)	Pelagic	GI/T	9 (55.5)	1.0 ± 1.1	fragments, film, monofilament	NR	Microscopic dissection	+	Rochman et al. (2015)
	<i>Sprattelloides gracilis</i> (Blue sprat)	Pelagic	GI/T	10 (40)	1.1 ± 1.7	fragments				
	<i>Signatus canaliculatus</i> (White-spotted spinefoot)	Pelagic	GI/T	3 (33.3)	0.3 ± 0.6	monofilaments				
Malaysia, local markets	<i>Chelon subviridis</i> (Greenback mullet)	Demersal	Viscera & gills	30 (30)	2	fragments, films, and filaments	PP, PE, PS, PET, nylon 6	Stereomicroscopy, Raman spectroscopy	+	Karami et al. (2017)
	<i>Johnius belangerii</i> (Belanger's croaker)	Demersal	Viscera & gills	30 (40)	14					
	<i>Rastrelliger kanagurta</i> (Indian mackerel)	Pelagic-neritic	flesh*	30 (10)	13					
			Viscera & gills	30 (10)	2					
	<i>Stolephorus waitei</i> (spotty-face anchovy)	Pelagic-neritic	Flesh*	30 (5)	1					
China, Yangtze estuary	<i>Hyporhamphus intermedius</i> (Garfish)	Pelagic	Flesh*	18 (100)	3.7 ± 2.2	fibres, fragments and pellets	cellophane, PET, PL, etc.	Stereomicroscopy, FTIR-microscopy	+	Jabeen et al. (2017)
	<i>Liza haematocheila</i> (Mullet)	Pelagic	GI/T (stomach, gut)	18 (100)	3.3 ± 0.3					
	<i>Coilia ectenes</i> (Anchovy)	Pelagic		18 (100)	4.0 ± 1.8					
	<i>Lateolabrax japonicus</i> (Japan Sea Bass)	Pelagic		18 (100)	2.1 ± 0.3					
	<i>Sillago sihama</i> (Silver Sillago)	Pelagic		18 (100)	2.8 ± 1.5					
	<i>Larimichthys crocea</i> (Large yellow croaker)	Benthic-pelagic		18 (100)	4.6 ± 3.4					
	<i>Pseudopis anomala</i> (Pacific Rudderfish)	Benthic-pelagic		18 (100)	1.1 ± 0.3					
	<i>Mugil cephalus</i> (Black Mullet)	Demersal		18 (100)	3.7 ± 1.0					
	<i>Terapon jarbua</i> (Tiger Perch)	Demersal		18 (100)	3.0 ± 0.7					
	<i>Sebastes marmoratus</i> (False Kelpfish)	Demersal		18 (100)	4.2 ± 1.3					
	<i>Photopictoralis bindus</i> (Orangefin Ponyfish)	Demersal		18 (100)	4.1 ± 2.1					
	<i>Thamnaconus septentrionalis</i> (Greenfin filefish)	Demersal		18 (100)	7.2 ± 2.8					
	<i>Oxyleotrix marmorata</i> (Marbled goby)	Demersal		18 (100)	4.2 ± 2.4					
	<i>Engraulis japonicus</i> (Japanese anchovy)	Benthic	GI/T	64 (77)	2.3 ± 2.5	fragments, beads, filaments, foam	PP, PE, PS, E/P copolymer, E/P diene terpolymer	Microscopy, FTIR	+	Tanaka and Takada (2016)
	<i>Stolephorus commersonnii</i> (Commerston's anchovy)	Brackish, pelagic-neritic	Gut	16 (38)	NR	NR	NR	Microscopy	NR	Kripa et al. (2014)
	<i>Alapes djedaba</i> (Shrimp Scad)	Pelagic, reef	Muscle	20 (NR)	0.8 ± 0.12 <sup>a</sup>	fragment, fibre, pellet	NR	Microscopy, SEM	+	Akhbarizadeh et al. (2017a)

(Continued)

Table 3. (Continued).

Location	Species	Habitat	Tissue	N and # individual ingested MPs (%)	Concentration (#/animal) <sup>1</sup>	Shape(s)	Type of polymer(s)	Identification method	QA	Ref.
Greece, Eastern Aegean Sea	<i>Epinephelus coioides</i> (Estuary Cod)	Benthic, brackish	Muscle	20 (NR)	0.78 ± 0.22 <sup>a</sup>					
	<i>Sphyrna jello</i> (Pickhandle barracuda)	Pelagic, brackish	Muscle	15 (NR)	0.57 ± 0.17 <sup>a</sup>					
	<i>Platycephalus indicus</i> (Bar-tailed Flathead)	Benthic	Muscle	16 (NR)	1.85 ± 0.5 <sup>a</sup>					
Europe	<i>Sphyrna viridensis</i> (Yellow Barracuda)	Epipelagic	Stomach	NR	42 ± 20.5	fibre	NR	Microscopy	NR	Miliou et al. (2016)
	<i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i> (Mediterranean Horse Mackerel)	Pelagic	Stomach		28 ± 19.5					
	<i>Boops boops</i> (Bogue)	Demersal	Stomach		15.4 ± 3.2					
Turkey, Mediterranean coast	<i>Argyrosomus regius</i> (Meagre)	Benthic-pelagic	GI	51 (75)	2.47	fibres, hard plastics	Copolymer P(Sisopropene, alloys (HIPPS)/ PP/P(M6), PA resin, PE, PP	Stereomicroscopy, FTIR- microscopy	+	Guven et al. (2017)
	<i>Caranx crysos</i> (Blue Runner)	Reef	GI	1 (100)	5					
	<i>Dentex gibbosus</i> (Pink Dentex)	Benthic-pelagic	GI	14 (29)	1					
	<i>Diplodus annularis</i> (Annular Seabream)	Benthic-pelagic	GI	48 (69)	2.85					
	<i>Lithognathus marmyrus</i> (Sand Seenbras)	Demersal	GI	46 (35)	1.88					
	<i>Liza aurata</i> (Golden Grey Mullet)	Pelagic-neritic	GI	39 (44)	7.47					
	<i>Mullus barbatus</i> (Blunt-Snout Mullet)	Demersal	GI	207 (66)	2.12					
	<i>Mullus surmuletus</i> (Striped Red Mullet)	Demersal	GI	51 (65)	1.82					
	<i>Nemipterus randalli</i> (Randall's Threadfin Bream)	Demersal	GI	135 (55)	2.24					
	<i>Pagellus acarne</i> (Axillary Seabream)	Benthic-pelagic	GI	52 (67)	2.46					
	<i>Pagellus erythrinus</i> (Common Pandora)	Benthic-pelagic	GI	54 (52)	1.21					
	<i>Pagrus pagrus</i> (Common Seabream)	Benthic-pelagic	GI	9 (78)	1.86					
	<i>Pelates quadrilineatus</i> (Fourlined Terapon)	Reef	GI	135 (65)	2.27					
	<i>Pomadasys incisus</i> (Bastard Grunt)	Demersal	GI	29 (55)	1.44					
	<i>Sardina philichard</i> (European Philichard)	Pelagic-neritic	GI	7 (57)	3.75					
	<i>Saurida undosquamis</i> (Brushtooth Lizardfish)	Reef	GI	99 (55)	2.2					
	<i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i> (Brown Meagre)	Demersal	GI	1 (100)	3					
	<i>Scomber japonicus</i> (Pacific Chub Mackerel)	Pelagic-neritic	GI	7 (71)	9.4					
	<i>Serranus cabrilla</i> (Comber)	Demersal	GI	6 (67)	2.25					

(Continued)



Table 3. (Continued).

Location	Species	Habitat	Tissue	N and # individual ingested MPs (%)	Concentration (#/animal) <sup>1</sup>	Shape(s)	Type of polymer(s)	Identification method	QA	Ref.
Spain, Atlantic and Mediterranean coast Spain, Balearic Islands	<i>Siganus luridus</i> (Dusky Spinefoot)	Reef	GIT	15 (87)	3.62					
	<i>Siganus aurata</i> (Gilthead Seabream)	Demersal	GIT	110 (44)	2					
	<i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i> (Mediterranean Horse Mackerel)	Pelagic-oceanic	GIT	98 (68)	2.58					
	<i>Mullus barbatus</i> (Blunt-Snout Mullet)	Demersal	Stomach	128 (18.8)	1.9 ± 1.3	fibres, spheres, film, fragments	NR	Stereomicroscopy	+	Bellas et al. (2016)
	<i>Boops boops</i> (Bogue)	Demersal	GIT	337 (57.8)	2.47–4.89	microfilaments	NR	Stereomicroscopy	+	Nadal et al. (2016)
	<i>Mullus surmuletus Linnaeus</i> 1758	Demersal	GIT	417 (27.3)		mostly filaments	PET, CA, polyacrylate, PAN, alkyd, polystyrene acrylonitrile methyl methacrylate	FTIR-microscopy	+	Alomar et al. (2017)
	(Striped Red Mullet) (trawling net)		GIT		0.32 ± 0.04					
	(trammel net)		GIT		0.68 ± 0.10					
	<i>Boops boops</i> (Bogue)	Demersal	GIT	27	1.46 ± 0.66	mostly fibres	NR	Microscopic dissection	+	Ferrer et al. (2016)
	<i>Sardina pilchardus</i> (European Pilchard)	Pelagic, near shore	GIT	17	1.43 ± 0.79					
Spain, western Mediterranean Sea	<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i> (Anchovy)	Pelagic	GIT	17	1.18 ± 0.40					
	Total:									
				183 (17)						
				1 (100)						
					1.0	particles and fibres	Particles: PP, PE, and alkyd resin. Fibres: rayon, PL, acrylic, nylon 6, and PE	Stereomicroscopy, FTIR-microscopy	+	Neves et al. (2015)
	<i>Alosa fallax</i> (Twaites Shad)	Pelagic-neritic	GIT							
	<i>Azygiosomus regius</i> (Meagre)	Benthic-pelagic	GIT	5 (60)	0.8 ± 0.8					
	<i>Boops boops</i> (Bogue)	Demersal	GIT	32 (9)	0.09 ± 0.3					
	<i>Dentex macrophthalmus</i> (Large-eye Dentex)	Benthic-pelagic	GIT	1 (100)	1					
	<i>Lophius piscatorius</i> (Angler)	Bathic-demersal	GIT	2 (50)	0.5					
France, Mediterranean Sea	<i>Mullus surmuletus</i> (Striped Red Mullet)	Demersal	GIT	1 (100)	2					
	<i>Mullus surmuletus</i> (Striped Red Mullet)	Demersal	GIT	3 (100)	1.66 ± 0.57					
	<i>Scomber japonicus</i> (Chub Mackerel)	Pelagic-neritic	GIT	35 (31)	0.57 ± 1.04					
	<i>Scomber scombrus</i> (Atlantic Mackerel)	Pelagic-neritic	GIT	13 (31)	0.46 ± 0.78					
	<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i> , L. (Anchovy)	Pelagic	Liver	13 (80)	NR	NR	PE, copolymer of styrene and acrylonitrile	Stereomicroscopy, Raman spectroscopy	+	Collard et al. (2017)
	<i>Sardina pilchardus</i> (European Pilchard)	Pelagic, near shore	Liver	2 (75)	NR					
	<i>Clupea harengus</i> (Atlantic Herring)	Pelagic, coastal	Liver	2 (75)	NR					
	<i>Limanda limanda</i> (Common Dab)	Demersal	GIT	89 (4.5)	0.03 ± 0.18	fibre, fragment	PE, PA, PP, PS, PET, PEST, PU	Stereomicroscopy, ATR-FTIR and FTIR-microscopy	+	Rummel et al. (2016)

(Continued)

Table 3. (Continued).

Location	Species	Habitat	Tissue	N and # individual ingested MPs (%)	Concentration (#/animal) <sup>1</sup>	Shape(s)	Type of polymer(s)	Identification method	QA	Ref.
Netherlands, Southern Bight, North Sea Denmark, North Sea and Baltic Sea	<i>Platichthys flesus</i> (Baltic Flounder)	Demersal	GI	36 (5.6)						
	<i>Gadus morhua</i> (Atlantic Cod)	Brackish, benthopelagic	GI	81 (1.2)	0.19 ± 0.61					
	<i>Scomber scombrus</i> (Atlantic Mackerel)	Pelagic	GI	51 (17.7)						
	<i>Sprattus sprattus</i> (Sprat)	Pelagic	GI	400 (0.25)	2	spherical particles	PMMA/acrylic	ATR-FTIR	+	Hermesen et al. (2017)
	<i>Gadus morhua</i> (Atlantic Cod, North Sea)	Brackish, benthopelagic	Stomach	28 (14)	NR	fragment, fibre	PU, PS, PP, PE	Raman spectroscopy	NR	Lenz et al. (2016a)
	<i>Gadus morhua</i> (Atlantic Cod, Baltic Sea)		Stomach	51 (16)						
	<i>Clupea harengus</i> (Atlantic Herring, North Sea)	Pelagic	Stomach	50 (30)						
	<i>Clupea harengus</i> (Atlantic Herring, Baltic Sea)		Stomach	55 (7)						
	<i>Clupea harengus</i> (Atlantic Herring)	Pelagic	Stomach	130 (50)	0–53	fibres, fragments	NR	Stereomicroscopy	+	Ogonowski et al. (2017)
	<i>Platichthys flesus</i> (Baltic Flounder)	Demersal	GI	40 (90)	0.43 ± 0.75	fibres	PA, acrylic, nylon, PE, PET	Microscopic dissection, ATR-FTIR	+	Mcgoran et al. (2017)
Sweden, coast	– Riverine 1									
	– Estuarine									
	– Riverine 2									
	<i>Osmerus eperlanus</i> (Smelt)	Pelagic	GI	10 (20)	0.2 ± 0.42					
Africa South Africa, KwaZulu-Natal, Durban Harbor	<i>Mugil cephalus</i> (Black Mullet)	Demersal	GI	72.8	3.8 ± 4.7	fibres, fragments, films, mono-filaments, and twine	PS, others not clarified	Microscopic dissection	+	Naldoo et al. (2016)
	<i>Atherinopsis californiensis</i> (Jack Silverside)	Pelagic	GI	7 (28.6)	1.6 ± 3.7 0.3 ± 0.5	fibres, fragment fibres, film, monofilament	NR	Microscopic dissection	+	Rochman et al. (2015)
North America USA, California, Half Moon Bay	<i>Engraulis mordax</i> (Anchovy)	Pelagic	GI	10 (30) 7 (28.6)	0.9 ± 1.2	film, fibre, foam				
	<i>Morone saxatilis</i> (Stripped Bass)	Pelagic	GI	4 (25)	0.25 ± 0.5	fibre				
	<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i> (Chinook Salmon)	Pelagic	GI	11 (9.1)	0.1 ± 0.3	film				
	<i>Ophiodon elongates</i> (Lingcod)	Brackish, benthopelagic	GI	205 (0.98)	1–2	fragment	NR	Visual and microscopic dissection	+	Liboiron et al. (2016)
	<i>Gadus morhua</i> (Atlantic Cod)	Demersal	GI	9 (100)	18.5 ± 18.9 (fibres) 0.7 ± 1.7 (others)	fibres, others (regular and irregular shapes)	NR	Stereomicroscopy	+	Pazos et al. (2017)
	<i>Lucioperca melodus pati</i> (Pati)									
Canada, eastern coast Newfoundland										
South America Argentina, Rio de la Plata estuary										

(Continued)

Table 3. (Continued).

Location	Species	Habitat	Tissue	N and # individual ingested MPs (%)	Concentration (#/animal) <sup>1</sup>	Shape(s)	Type of polymer(s)	Identification method	QA	Ref.
Brazil, Paraíba and Mamanguape estuaries	<i>Pseudoplattystoma coruscans</i>	Demersal	GI	2 (100)						
	(Spotted Sorubim)									
	<i>Oligosarcus oligolepis</i>	Pelagic	GI	5 (100)						
	(Bocudo)									
	<i>Parapimelodus valenciennis</i>	Demersal	GI	21 (100)						
	(Long-whiskered catfish)									
	<i>Odontesthes bonariensis</i>	Brackish	GI	1 (100)						
	(Pejerrey)									
	<i>Asyanax rutilus</i>	Benthopelagic	GI	12 (100)						
	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	Pelagic	GI	2 (100)						
	(Common Carp)									
	<i>Pimelodus maculatus</i>	Benthopelagic	GI	14 (100)						
	(Long-whiskered catfish)									
	<i>Prochilodus lineatus</i>	Benthopelagic	GI	5 (100)						
	(Streaked Prochilod)									
	<i>Hypostomus commersoni</i>	Demersal	GI	2 (100)						
	(Red Fin Uruguay)									
	<i>Cyphocharax voga</i>	Benthopelagic	GI	14 (100)						
	(Characin)									
	<i>Opishonema oglinum</i>	Pelagic	GI	196 (9)	0.33	fibres, films, and fragments	NR	Stereomicroscopy	+	Vendel et al. (2017)
	(Atlantic Thread Herring)									
	<i>Rhinosardinia bahiensis</i>	Pelagic	GI		0.35					
	<i>Anchoa januaria</i>	Pelagic-neritic	GI		0.13					
	(Rio Anchovy)									
	<i>Lycengraulis grossidens</i>	Pelagic-neritic	GI		0.17					
	(Atlantic Sabretooth Anchovy)									
	<i>Atherinella brasiliensis</i>	Benthopelagic	GI		0.03					
	(Brazilian Silverside)									
	<i>Poecilia vivipara</i>	Benthopelagic	GI		0.11					
	(Gargaru)									
	<i>Hyphorhamphus unifasciatus</i>	Reefs	GI		0.15					
	(Common Halfbeak)									
	<i>Oligoplites saurus</i>	Reefs	GI		0.17					
	(Leatherjacket)									
	<i>Diapterus auratus</i>	Demersal	GI		0.97					
	(Irish Mojarra)									
	<i>Diapterus rhombeus</i>	Demersal	GI		0.06					
	(Caitipa Mojarra)									
	<i>Eucinostomus argenteus</i>	Reefs	GI		0.02					
	(Silver Mojarra)									
	<i>Eugerres brasiliensis</i>	Demersal		GI	0.06					
	(Brazilian Mojarra)									
	<i>Achirus lineatus</i>	Reefs	GI		0.5					
	<i>Symphurus tessellatus</i>	Demersal	GI		0.25					
	(Tessellated Tonguefish)									
	<i>Sphaeroides testudineus</i>	Reefs	GI		0.09					
	(Checkered Puffer)									
Brazil, Goiana Estuary	<i>Cynoscion acoupa</i>	Coastal, Demersal, Brackish	Stomach		0.08	filament	NR	Stereomicroscopy	+	Ferreira et al. (2016a)
	(Acoupa Weakfish)									

(Continued)



Table 3. (Continued).

Location	Species	Habitat	Tissue	N and # individual ingested MPs (%)	Concentration (#/animal) <sup>1</sup>	Shape(s)	Type of polymer(s)	Identification method	QA	Ref.
Brazil, Goiana Estuary	– juvenile: 14–220 mm)			469 (64)	1.8–2.5					
	– sub-adult: 220–340 mm)			25 (50)	2–8					
	– adult: >340 mm)			33 (100)	5.4–25.9					
Chile, Easter Island, Rapa Nui	<i>Stellifer brasiliensis</i> (Stardrum)	Demersal	Stomach	330 (6.9)	0.33 ± 0.08	fragments	PA	Stereomicroscopy	NR	Dantas et al. (2012)
	<i>Stellifer stellifer</i> (Little Croaker)	Brackish, Demersal	Stomach	239 (9.2)	0.52 ± 0.13					
	<i>Decapterus muroadsi</i> (Amberstripe Cad)	Pelagic	GIT	20 (80)	2.5 ± 0.4	hard fragments, soft fragments, thread, film	PE, plastic paint (alkyd resins & epoxy-polyesters), PP	Microscopic dissection, ATR-FTIR and FTIR-microscopy	NR	Ory et al. (2017)
Mexico, estuary of the Gulf of Mexico	<i>Lutjanus campechanus</i> (Red Snapper)	Shallow waters, Reefs	GIT	2	NR	filament, fragment, film	NR	Microscopic dissection, FTIR	NR	Phillips and Bonner (2015)
	<i>Lutjanus griseus</i> (Mangrove Snapper)	Near shore, hard-bottom and coral	GIT	5						
	<i>Lagodon rhomboides</i> (Bream)	Vegetated bottom, mangrove	GIT	48						
Chile, Easter Island, Rapa Nui	<i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i> (Red Drum)	Brackish, demersal	GIT	28						
	<i>Cynoscion nebulosus</i> (Spotted Seatrout)	Brackish, demersal	GIT	20						
	<i>Paralichthys lethostigma</i> (Southern Flounder)	Estuarine, coastal waters	GIT	8						
	<i>Coryphaena hippurus</i> (Common dolphinfish)	Open waters, near coastal areas	GIT	2						
	Total:			116 (10.4)						

PA: polyamide, PAN: polyacrylonitrile, PE: polyethylene, PET: polyethylene terephthalate, PL: polyester, PMMA: polymethylmethacrylate, PP: polypropylene, PS: polystyrene, PU: polyurethane; <sup>1</sup>: average, average ± standard deviation or range, N = the number of collected samples, NR = Not Reported, unkn = unknown, QA = Quality Assurance, + = the study implemented measures to prevent microplastics contamination such as the analysis of blank samples, cleaning of all equipment and contact materials, and wearing 100% cotton coat during analysis, \*: flesh refers to all part of fish, including the bones, but do not include gills and viscera.

sampling, isolation and identification of microplastics may limit the comparability of the results.

Several studies implemented preventive measures to avoid sample contamination during analysis (Tables 1–4). This precautionary step is important since background contamination can occur due to plastics fibres from synthetic cloth, the usage of plastic equipment or insufficiently cleaned equipment, and poorly sealed samples. Procedures applied in preventing contamination include the application of procedural blanks, rinsed equipment, filtered solutions, clean laminar flow cabinet, coverage of samples, nitrile gloves, and the use of a cotton laboratory coat (Wesch et al. 2016). The implementation of strict quality assurance measures during microplastic analysis has been proved to be effective in preventing plastic contamination (Hermsen et al. 2017).

### Sediment

Table 1 shows that sediment at the coastline of the Beibu Gulf (South China Sea) contains the highest number of microplastics, i.e. 5,020–8,720 particles/kg dw. An extremely high coastal population density and which produced the highest mass of mismanaged plastic waste in 2010, i.e. 1.32–3.53 MMT (Jambeck et al. 2015) are probably the most important factors explaining the microplastic pollution. The second and third most polluted coastal areas are Halifax Harbor – an urban estuary on the Atlantic coast of Canada, and the bay and beaches of Huatulco, Mexico. Both areas are also located close to human activities (Mathalon and Hill 2014; Retama et al. 2016).

The timing of the measurements can also play a role in determining the amount of microplastics in sediments as is demonstrated in the study on the Huatulco beaches in Mexico (Retama et al. 2016). The amount of microplastics fluctuated with tourism activity, resulting in higher levels of microplastics in sediment samples taken in December (tourism season) than in those taken in April. Hotels and sewage disposals in the proximity of beaches have been previously identified as potential sources of plastic debris (Cole et al. 2011).

### Water column

Table 2 provides an overview of microplastics detected in the water column of coastal areas. The concentration ranges reported for the water column show more variation than in sediments, which is in line with the more dynamic character of the water column. Reported concentrations were highest in Incheon/Kyeonggi Bay and Jinhae Bay in South Korea. These areas are reported to be affected by microplastics originating from both aquatic (i.e., aquaculture, fishing activities, and international harbour) and terrestrial sources. The density of microplastics varied with water depth, i.e. the concentration in the surface microlayer was significantly higher than in water 30 cm below the surface (Chae et al. 2015).

Consistent with the pollution of the sediments, the level of microplastics in urban estuaries in China is relatively high (100–4,100 particles/m<sup>3</sup>) (Zhao et al. 2015). This is in line with the high numbers of microplastics detected in sediment samples from Chinese coastal regions (Table 1).

### Plastic types

The dominant types of polymers detected in sediment of coastal areas (Table 1) are polyethylene (PE), polypropylene (PP), polystyrene (PS), polyethylene terephthalate (PET) and polyamide (PA). The same polymer types are dominant in the water column (Table 2), together with polyvinylchloride (PVC). PE, PP and PA are widely used in textiles (Desforges et al. 2014) and fishing gear (e.g., ropes, nets, and fishing lines) (Claessens et al. 2011). PS, PVC and PET are primarily used as packaging materials, e.g., plastic bags, bottles, caps, films, containers, etc. (Claessens et al. 2011), but PE and PP are also used for this purpose. Of these five classes of commonly used polymers, PE, PP as well as the expanded form of polystyrene (EPS), have a lower density than sea water (1.02 g cm<sup>-3</sup>), while PVC and PET, have a higher density. Taking only polymer density into account, one would expect PE, PP and EPS to dominate in the water column (Andrady 2015), and PVC and PET in the sediment (Galgani et al. 2015). However, this pattern does not emerge from the data presented in Tables 1 and 2 as low density polymers (i.e. PE, PP and EPS) are frequently

detected in sediments and conversely PVC and PET are found in the water column. This points towards the impact of other processes, i.e. floating plastics can be washed ashore and sedimented plastics can resuspend by strong currents (Chubarenko and Stepanova 2017). Furthermore, the density of microplastics may change due to biofouling and leaching of additives (Galgani et al. 2015).

### Microplastic forms in coastal seafood

Tables 3 and 4 summarize the available data on microplastics detected in respectively coastal fish & shellfish species. From the data it is clear that a large variety of microplastic forms are present in a wide range of coastal seafood species. Dominant forms are fibres, fragments, films and filament, whereas spheres, pellets, foam, beads, twines, threads and flakes are less common. Unfortunately, since polymer identification is not frequently performed, only limited information is available on the polymer types found in fish and shellfish.

### Commercially important fish

Microplastics are found in the gastrointestinal tract of both pelagic and demersal fish species that are commercially important for human consumption. The ingestion of microplastics by fish is mostly documented for predatory species, though some of the investigated species are primary filter feeding fish (Table 3). The amount of microplastics found in coastal fish species varies considerably between and within studies. The species-specific average values cover the range between 0 and 7.2 particles/animal. At least a part of this variation is caused by the fact that different tissues have been analysed. Some studies analysed the contents of the whole gut/gastrointestinal tract, while other studies merely analysed the contents of the stomach. Jabeen et al. (2017) compared the abundance of microplastics between stomach and gut from fish caught along the Chinese coast. In some of the 24 fish species analysed in this study, the abundance of plastics in the guts was higher than in the stomach. The authors suggest that the entire digestive tract should be analysed to obtain a realistic indication of the number of plastics to which animals are actually exposed (Jabeen et al. 2017).

Fish collected from the coastal areas of China are reported to contain the highest number of microplastics, i.e. 1.1–7.2 particles/animal. This finding is consistent with the high levels of microplastics found in coastal sediments and water of China (Tables 1 and 2) (Qiu et al. 2015; Zhao et al. 2015; Yu et al. 2016). Relatively high levels of microplastics were also detected in bogue (*Boops boops*) from the Balearic islands (2.47–4.89 particle/species) (Nadal et al. 2016) and the flathead grey mullet (*Mugil cephalus*) from Durban Harbor, South Africa ( $3.8 \pm 4.7$  particle/species) (Naidoo et al. 2016). Although data on microplastics in sediments and seawater of the Balearic Islands are lacking, the islands are subject to high levels of human activity such as commercial and recreational boating and coastal tourism (Naidoo et al. 2016). This may explain why the plastic pollution in that area is relatively high.

Several studies have pointed out that demersal fish species tend to contain more microplastics than pelagic species (Jabeen et al. 2017; Vendel et al. 2017). The data collected in this review (Table 3) confirm this as demersal species such as greenfin filefish (*Thamnaconus septentrionalis*), marbled goby (*Oxyeleotrix marmorata*), false kelpfish (*Sebastes marmoratus*), orange fin ponyfish (*Photopectoralis bindus*), black mullet (*Mugil cephalus*), tiger perch (*Terapon jarbua*), bogue (*Boops boops*), and Irish mojarra (*Diapterus auratus*) tend to have high microplastics levels. Demersal fish species live close to the seafloor where plastic litter accumulates. When feeding on benthic prey, some sediments will be swallowed together with the prey which increases the risk of ingesting plastic accidentally (Bellas et al. 2016).

### Commercial shellfish and other seafood

Microplastics are widely found in shellfish species, such as bivalves and crustaceans (Table 4). Most studies focused on the blue mussel (*Mytilus edulis*) and oyster (*Crassostrea gigas*). Some studies also investigated microplastics in clam (*Venerupis philippinarum*), rock oyster (*Saccostrea forskalii*), and sea snail (*Littorina littorea*). Commercially important crustaceans such as brown shrimp (*Crangon crangon*), Norwegian lobster (*Nephrops norvegicus*), and crabs (*Carcinus maenas* and *Eriocheir*

*sinensis*) have also been found to ingest microplastics. Moreover, the presence of microplastics was also observed in echinoderms such as sea cucumber (Holothurian).

The abundance of microplastics is generally higher in shellfish than in fish. This can be attributed to the feeding strategy of shellfish, since most of them are filter feeders. Filter feeders, such as bivalves, oysters, and clams, display a non-selective feeding behaviour and are, therefore, more likely to ingest microplastics (Wesch et al. 2016). However, not all filter feeders are non-selective; the blue mussel (*Mytilus edulis*), for instance, displays selective feeding (i.e. selective feeding on particles of certain size) and particle rejecting behaviour (i.e. expelling particles as pseudofaeces) (Browne et al. 2008; De Witte et al. 2014; Van Cauwenberghe et al. 2015). Nevertheless, the highest numbers of microplastics were found in mussels from Halifax Harbor (Nova Scotia, Canada), i.e. 34–75 particles/animal. Considering Halifax Harbor Canada is one of the most polluted coastal areas with microplastics (Table 1), it is not surprising that mussels from that area contain high numbers of microplastics. This pattern can also be observed for China. The ranges of microplastics in shellfish varied between 4.3–57.2 particles/animal (2.1–10.5 particles/g ww) for 9 commercial bivalves collected from fishery farms or in situ along the coastal areas of China (Li et al. 2015), and 1.5–7.6 particles/animal (0.9–4.6 particles/g ww) in *M. edulis* from coastal areas of China (Li et al. 2016). Li et al. (2016) compared the abundance of microplastics in mussels from heavily contaminated areas and slightly contaminated areas along the coast of China, and concluded that mussels from heavily contaminated areas contain higher numbers of microplastics than those from less contaminated areas (Li et al. 2016).

Several studies have compared microplastics abundance in wild and cultured mussels, oysters, and clams. Those studies revealed that cultured shellfish tend to contain more microplastics than those sampled in situ. There are several possible explanations for this difference. In Canada, the use of plastic polypropylene lines in farm areas is considered the main reason for the higher number of microplastics in farmed mussels (Mathalon and Hill 2014). Another study linked the higher levels of microplastics in cultured *M. edulis* to fishery

activities in the harbors and ports, such as fishing net repair and dumping of old nets (De Witte et al. 2014). A study in British Columbia, Canada, found that manila clams (*Venerupis philippinarum*) from shellfish farms had more plastic fibres than manila clams collected from beaches, but this difference was not significant (Davidson and Dudas 2016). Contrasting results were obtained by a study in China, which revealed that farmed mussels were less polluted (1.6 particles/g) than wild mussels (2.7 particles/g). The farmed mussels in China were cultured in areas with good water quality (i.e., areas less affected by human activities), while the wild mussels were taken from highly polluted coastal areas (Li et al. 2016). These results indicate that the level of microplastics pollution in the marine environment is an important factor determining the abundance of microplastics in mussels.

In addition to selective feeding and rejection behaviour (of *M. edulis*), bivalves also have the ability, when transferred to clean sea water, to depurate contaminants from their guts, including microplastics (GESAMP 2016). So far, only one study has examined the potential reduction of microplastics in bivalves through depuration (Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen 2014). The study showed that after three days of depuration the levels of microplastics in blue mussel (*M. edulis*) taken from the North Sea (Germany) reduced from  $0.36 \pm 0.07$  particles/g ww to  $0.24 \pm 0.07$  particles/g ww. The same trend was observed in a study on pacific oyster (*C. gigas*) from Brittany, France. This study determined a decrease of microplastics levels after a three days-depuration period from  $0.47 \pm 0.16$  particles/g ww to  $0.35 \pm 0.05$  particles/g ww. It can be concluded that, although depuration reduces the number of microplastics in shellfish, most particles seem to remain in the animals. Further research is needed to determine the impact of depuration on the removal of microplastics more precisely, particularly to determine the time required by bivalves to remove all or most of the microplastics.

### **Trophic transfer**

Microplastics can accumulate within the food chain. Although only limited data is available, experimental evidence, mainly from laboratory-controlled studies, confirms that microplastics can be transferred





Table 4. Summary of available data on microplastics detected in coastal shellfish species.

Location	Species	Habitat	Tissue	N and # individual ingested MPs (%)	Concentration Concentration (#/animal) <sup>1</sup> (#/gram ww) <sup>2</sup>	Shape(s)/ Form (s)	Type of polymer(s)	Identification method	QA	Ref.
<b>Asia</b>										
China, Shanghai	9 commercial bivalves	Fishery farms Coastal waters	Soft tissue	NR	4.3–57.2	2.1–10.5	NR	FTIR-microscopy	+	Li et al. (2015)
China, coastline	<i>Mytilus edulis</i> (Blue mussel)	Intertidal shallow water	Soft tissue	NR	1.5–7.6	0.9–4.6	CP, PET, PL	FTIR-microscopy and SEM	+	Li et al. (2016)
	– Farm – Wild				NR NR	1.6 2.7				
Thailand, upper Gulf of Thailand	<i>Saccostrea forskalii</i> (Rock Oyster)	Intertidal, rocky shores	Soft tissue	NR	NR	0.37–0.57	PA, PET, PS	Raman spectroscopy	NR	Gamage et al. (2017)
	<i>Littoraria sp</i> (Periwinkle)	Mangrove	Soft tissue	NR	NR	0.17–0.23				
<b>Europe</b>										
Belgium, coastline	<i>Mytilus edulis</i> (Blue mussel)	Intertidal shallow water	Soft tissue	NR	NR	0.35	NR	Stereomicroscopy	+	De Witte et al. (2014)
	– Farm – Wild				NR NR	0.26–0.51				
France, Atlantic coast	<i>Mytilus edulis</i> (Blue mussel)	Intertidal shallow water	Soft tissue	NR	0.61 ± 0.56	0.23 ± 0.20	PP, PE, PE-PP copolymer, PS, PMMA, PL, ABS	FTIR-microscopy	+	Phuong et al. (2017)
	<i>Crassostrea gigas</i> (Pacific Oyster)	Estuaries	Soft tissue	NR	2.10 ± 1.71	0.18 ± 0.16	PE, PP, ABS, PE-PP copolymer, PL, PIB, PS			
Germany, North Sea	<i>Mytilus edulis</i> (Blue mussel)	Intertidal shallow water	Soft tissue	NR	NR	0.36 ± 0.07	NR	μ-Raman spectroscopy	+	Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen (2014)
	<i>Crassostrea gigas</i> (Pacific oyster)	– pre depuration – post depuration	Soft tissue	NR	NR	0.24 ± 0.07				
France, Brittany	<i>Crassostrea gigas</i> (Pacific oyster)	Estuaries	Soft tissue	NR	NR	0.47 ± 0.16	NR	μ-Raman spectroscopy	+	Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen (2014)
	– pre depuration – post depuration				NR NR	0.35 ± 0.05				
Netherlands, North Sea coast	<i>Carcinus maenas</i> (Littoral Crab)	Estuaries, intertidal zone, pelagic	Soft tissue	0%	NR	0	NR	FTIR-microscopy	+	Leslie et al. (2017)
	<i>Mytilus edulis</i> (Blue mussel)	Intertidal shallow water	Soft tissue	NR		13.1				
France, Belgium & Netherlands, North Sea coast	<i>Crassostrea gigas</i> (Pacific Oyster)	Estuaries	Soft tissue	NR		2.4–10.9				
	<i>Littorina littorea</i> (Periwinkle)	Rocky coasts, mud flats, estuaries	Soft tissue	NR		2.5–3.8				
Poland, Baltic Sea coast	<i>Mytilus edulis</i> (Blue mussel)	Intertidal shallow water	Soft tissue	NR	NR	0.2 ± 0.3	LDPE, HDPE, PS	μ-Raman spectroscopy	+	Van Cauwenberghe et al. (2015)
	<i>Ericocheir sinensis</i> (Chinese Mitten Crab)	Estuaries	Stomach	9–28%	NR	NR	NR	Microscopy	NR	Wójcik-Fudalewska et al. (2016)
Scotland, Clyde Sea	<i>Nephrops norvegicus</i> (Norway Lobster)	Muddy bottoms	GIT	83%	NR	NR	PP	Microscopy, SEM, Raman	+	Murray and Cowie (2011)
	<i>Crangon crangon</i> (Brown Shrimp)	Benthic	Whole	63%	1.23 ± 0.99	0.68 ± 0.55	NR	Stereomicroscopy and hot needle test	+	Devriese et al. (2015)

(Continued)

Table 4. (Continued).

Location	Species	Habitat	Tissue	N and # individual ingested MPs (%)	Concentration (#/animal) <sup>1</sup>	Concentration (#/gram ww) <sup>2</sup>	Shape(s)/Form (s)	Type of polymer(s)	Identification method	QA	Ref.
<b>North America</b> USA, Californian market	<i>Crassostrea gigas</i> (Pacific Oyster)	Estuaries	Soft tissue	33.3%	1.0 ± 1.1	NR	fibres	NR	Microscopic dissection	+	Rochman et al. (2015)
	<i>Venerupis philippinarum</i> (Manila Clam)	Intertidal zone, estuaries/brackish	Soft tissue	41%	8.4 ± 8.5	0.9 ± 0.9	fibres, films, fragments	NR	Microscopy	+	Davidson and Dudas (2016)
		• Wild • Farm		59%	11.3 ± 6.6	1.7 ± 1.2					
Canada, Nova Scotia, Halifax Harbor	Mussels (unspecified)	• Wild • Farm	Soft tissue	NR	34	NR	filaments, fragments, film	PP, PET, polymethacrylate, PS, PA	Microscopic dissection	+	Mathalon and Hill (2014)
	Holothurian (sea cucumber)	Benthic	Stomach, mouth, gills	NR	2	NR	microfibres	Modified acrylic, PP	Polarized light microscopy	+	Taylor et al. (2016)
<b>Equatorial mid-Atlantic</b>											

CP: cellophane, PA: polyamide, PE: polyethylene, LDPE: low density polyethylene, HDPE: high density polyethylene, PET: polyethylene terephthalate, PIB: polyisobutylene; PL: polyester, PMMA: polymethylmethacrylate, PP: polypropylene, PS: polystyrene, PU: polyurethane; <sup>1</sup>: average, average ± standard deviation or range, N = the number of collected samples, NR = Not Reported, unkn = unknown, QA = Quality Assurance, + = the study implemented measures to prevent microplastics contamination such as the analysis of blank samples, cleaning of all equipment and contact materials, and wearing 100% cotton coat during analysis.

between trophic levels (Carbery et al. 2018). The trophic transfer of microplastics have been proven by a field study (Miliou et al. 2016) and laboratory experiments (Farrell and Nelson 2013; Tosetto et al. 2017). Setälä et al. (2014) reported the uptake of 10 µm fluorescent polystyrene microspheres in several Baltic Sea zooplankton taxa and demonstrated the potential of trophic transfer via other planktonic species. Trophic transfer has also been observed between beach hoppers, frill gobies and ray-finned fish (Tosetto et al. 2017), and between mussels (*M. edulis*) and crabs (*C. maenas*) (Farrell and Nelson 2013). A similar study using mussels (*Perna perna*) as prey and puffer fish (*Spheoeroides greeleyi*) and crab (*Callinectes ornatus*) as predators, revealed the presence of microplastic particles in the faeces of the predators, but only when fed contaminated mussels. Notwithstanding the confirmed transfer of microplastics to both fish and crabs, the risk to higher trophic levels can be considered as negligible due to the rapid depuration of the microplastics (Santana et al. 2017).

Concluding, there are sufficient indications that trophic level transfer may lead to accumulation in higher trophic levels (GESAMP 2016). This triggers concerns about human health since fish and shellfish of higher trophic levels are often on our menu. This holds particularly for the consumption of shellfish, such as bivalves, and small fish like anchovies, since these species are eaten whole (GESAMP 2016). However, the implications of trophic transfer of microplastics for higher predators and eventually humans are still poorly understood (Carbery et al. 2018).

### Uptake and toxicity of microplastics in coastal seafood species

Table 5 provides an overview of toxicity assessments performed on coastal fish and shellfish. Fish species have been exposed to plastic polymers, such as PE, PVC and LDPE, in various sizes and concentrations, whereas PS, PP and HDPE have been used in shellfish studies. All types of plastics used in experimental toxicity studies are widely produced and used (Barnes et al. 2009).

Several intestinal uptake mechanisms for nano-sized and micro-sized particles up to 150 µm are described for vertebrates (Volkheimer 1977;

Powell et al. 2010; Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen 2014; Bouwmeester et al. 2015). In addition, laboratory studies with vertebrate species, including fish have demonstrated plastic particle translocation. For instance, translocation of PS nanoparticles (53 nm & 180 nm) has been observed in the brain of Crucian carp (*Carassius carassius*) (Mattsson et al. 2017) while Collard et al. (2017) demonstrated the translocation of microplastic particles ( $323 \pm 101 \mu\text{m}$ ) in the liver of commercial species of European anchovies (*Engraulis encrasicolus*), Atlantic herring (*Clupea harengus*) and European pilchard (*Sardina pilchardus*). However, further research is needed to assess the exact translocation pathways of nano- and micro-sized particles (Collard et al. 2017).

Based on the reported data on microplastics in wild seafood species, it has been argued that the likelihood of translocation in fish is small (Jovanović 2017). However, it should be kept in mind that translocation of microplastic particles measuring less than  $150 \mu\text{m}$  may be underreported due to the lack of analytical methods capable of characterizing and quantifying small-sized plastic particles from samples taken from wild-caught animals (GESAMP 2016).

Several dietary toxicity studies with microplastics have been performed on fish species. Ferreira et al. (2016b) exposed common goby (*Pomatoschistus microps*) to PE particles ( $1\text{--}5 \mu\text{m}$ ), alone or in combination with gold nanoparticles. The PE particles did not influence the uptake or the toxic effects of the gold nanoparticles, nor were any PE particle-related changes detected in the predatory performance of the fish. However, ethoxyresorufin-O-deethylase (EROD) and glutathione-S-transferase (GST) assays revealed a significantly increased phase I biotransformation activity and increased oxidative stress in the PE particle-exposed group under increased temperature (from  $20^\circ\text{C}$  to  $25^\circ\text{C}$ ). A study with larvae of the European bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) revealed that the ingestion of PE microbeads ( $10\text{--}45 \mu\text{m}$ ) for 7–43 days increased cytochrome P450 1A1 (*cyp1a1*) expression and caused obstruction of the gastrointestinal tract, although no significant effects on larval growth were observed. The highest exposure concentration ( $12 \text{ mg PE/g diet}$ ) led to increased mortality during the first stages of sea bass larval development, which

was attributed to the narrow diameter of the esophageal, gastric and intestinal lumens of the fish larvae (Mazurais et al. 2015). The ingestion of PVC particles ( $<300 \mu\text{m}$ ) at 0.1% w/w of feed by adults of European bass for 90 days resulted in structural and functional deterioration of the distal gut, but did not increase mortality (Peda et al. 2016). A study in which Japanese rice fish (*Oryzias latipes*) were fed PE pellets ( $<500 \mu\text{m}$ ; 10% w/w of diet) found a reduced choriogenin (Chg H) gene expression in male fish, and a reduced vitellogenin (Vtg I), Chg H and estrogen receptor gene expression in female fish, which are early signs of endocrine disruption (Rochman et al. 2014). Exposure to  $0.1 \text{ g L}^{-1}$  of 53 nm PS nanoparticles caused morphological changes in the brain and affected hunting and feeding behaviour in Crucian carp (*Carassius carassius*) while exposure to  $0.1 \text{ g L}^{-1}$  of 180 nm PS particles revealed faster feeding and higher activity (Mattsson et al. 2017). Exposure of developing zebra fish (*Danio rerio*) to 51 nm PS nanoparticles ( $0.1, 1, \text{ or } 10 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$ ) from 6 hours to 120 h post-fertilization (hpf), revealed accumulation in the yolk at 24 hpf followed by migration to the gastrointestinal tract, gallbladder, liver, pancreas, heart, and brain during 48–120 hpf. The exposure did not cause significant mortality, morphological deformities or changes in mitochondrial metabolism but decreased heart rate in embryos and induced larval swimming hypoactivity. A depuration phase (120–168 hpf) decreased the concentration in all organs, although at a slower rate in the pancreas and the gastrointestinal tract (Pitt et al. 2017).

Several studies have focused on the impact of PS particles on shellfish, and in particular on the blue mussel (*Mytilus edulis*). As mentioned before, *M. edulis* is a selective filter feeder, ingesting only algae and particles of appropriate size and shape. Larger particles are selectively expelled as pseudofaeces (Defosse and Hawkins 1997; Ward and Shumway 2004). In congruence, an 8 hours exposure to 30 nm PS particles (at 0, 0.1, 0.2 and  $0.3 \text{ mg mL}^{-1}$ ) resulted in reduced filtering activity and the production of nanopolystyrene containing pseudofaeces (Wegner et al. 2012). In addition, by simultaneously exposing *M. edulis* to 10, 30, and  $90 \mu\text{m}$  PS particles ( $110 \text{ particles/mL}$  for 14 days), Van Cauwenberghe et al. (2015) showed that the smallest particles are more easily retained than the larger

particles. Furthermore, Kholandhasamy et al. (2018) revealed that adherence of microfibers to the surface of soft tissues of *M. edulis* contributes strongly to the accumulation, particularly in organs not involved in ingestion processes. Translocation of particles from the gut to the circulatory system of *M. edulis* was demonstrated for PS microspheres with sizes of 3 and 9.6  $\mu\text{m}$  (Browne et al. 2008).

A number of studies demonstrated that microplastics have the potential to induce a variety of physiological effects in bivalves. Exposure of *M. edulis* to HDPE particles (0–80  $\mu\text{m}$ ) at 2.5  $\text{mg mL}^{-1}$  resulted in an inflammatory response of the digestive tract after 3 hours of exposure as indicated by granulocytoma formation at tissue level and decreased stability of lysosomal membrane at cellular and subcellular levels (von Moos et al. 2012). Exposure of the Mediterranean mussel (*Mytilus galloprovincialis*) to PE and PS particles <100  $\mu\text{m}$  (both in the form of virgin particles and contaminated with pyrene) at 1.5  $\text{g L}^{-1}$  for 7 days caused alterations of immunological responses, the lysosomal compartment, peroxisomal proliferation, the antioxidant system, neurotoxic effects, onset of genotoxicity and changes in gene expression profile (Avio et al. 2015). Exposure of *Mytilus spp.* for 7 days to PS microbeads (with size 2  $\mu\text{m}$  and 6  $\mu\text{m}$ , both virgin particles at 32  $\text{g L}^{-1}$  and contaminated with fluoranthene particles at 30  $\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) and followed by depuration, resulted in increased haemocyte mortality and triggered substantial modulation of the cellular oxidative balance (i.e., increased reactive oxygen species production in haemocytes, and increased antioxidant and glutathione-related enzymes in mussel tissues) (Paul-Pont et al. 2016). A study using oyster species showed that the exposure of PS spheres (with size 2  $\mu\text{m}$  and 6  $\mu\text{m}$  at 0.023  $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) to *Crassostrea gigas* for 2 months showed increased food consumption, reproductive disruption (significant decreases in oocyte number, diameter and sperm velocity), and reduction of offspring performance during larval stages (Sussarellu et al. 2016). The higher food consumption by the oyster suggests an increase of stress and energy demand to maintain homeostasis (Sussarellu et al. 2016). *Atactodea striata*, a clam commonly found at the coast in Hong Kong, was fed 0, 10, 1000 items/L PS microgranules sized

between 63  $\mu\text{m}$  and 250  $\mu\text{m}$  for 10 days. While the respiration rate and absorption efficiency remained unchanged, the highest concentration caused a reduction in the clearance rate which could reduce the energy intake. However, it was noted that the production of pseudofaeces and faeces, and depuration in clean water, effectively limited the ingestion and retention of microplastics, resulting in low amounts of microplastics in the body (Xu et al. 2017).

A few studies reported on uptake and toxicity of microplastics in crustaceans. In a dietary study, Brennecke et al. (2015) showed that particles larger than 150  $\mu\text{m}$  can be translocated in the mud-flat fiddler crab (*Uca rapax*). The ingested PS particles (180–250  $\mu\text{m}$  at 108–1000  $\text{mg kg}^{-1}$  of dry sediment) were subsequently detected in the gills, stomach and hepatopancreas. Dietary exposure of the Norway lobster (*Nephrops norvegicus*) to PCB-spiked PE and PS microspheres (6  $\mu\text{m}$ , 500–600  $\mu\text{m}$ ) at 155  $\text{mg}/9.64 \text{ g}$  of gelatin cubes for three weeks followed by one week of depuration, had no impact on the nutritional state of wild *Nephrops*, but revealed a limited accumulation of PCBs in tail tissue for PE particles of 500–600  $\mu\text{m}$  (Devriese et al. 2017). Dietary exposure of the shore crab *Carcinus maenas* to PP fibres (1–5 mm in length) for 4 weeks showed reduced food consumption from 0.33 to 0.03  $\text{g d}^{-1}$  and significant reduction of available energy for growth from 0.59 to  $-0.31 \text{ kJ d}^{-1}$  in crabs fed with 1% plastic (Watts et al. 2015), suggesting a depletion of energy storage.

Studying the presence and effects of nano- and microplastics in planktonic animal species that have a pivotal role in the food chain can provide insight into the detrimental effects of plastic pollution through the aquatic food web. Dietary exposure of the water flea (*Daphnia magna*), a planktonic freshwater crustacean, to a range of polymeric nanoparticles revealed toxic effects for 52 nm-sized amino-modified positively charged PS nanoparticles (> 0.075  $\text{g L}^{-1}$ , 13 hours exposure), whereas larger particles of the same material (120–330 nm, at 0.025–0.15  $\text{g L}^{-1}$ ) did not induce any observable effects. Interestingly, indirect intake via algal food was higher than direct intake from water (Mattsson et al. 2017). Larval stages of

brine shrimp (*Artemia franciscana*) and barnacle (*Amphibalanus Amphitrite*), two marine planktonic crustaceans, were exposed for 24 and 48 h to 0.1  $\mu\text{m}$  PS beads at concentrations ranging from 0.001 to 10  $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ . The results showed accumulation of PS beads in the gut of both crustaceans after 24 and 48 hours. It was noted that brine shrimps constantly ingested and excreted microbeads whereas barnacle did not excrete microplastics. No significantly increased mortality was observed (in both larvae), but exposure to high concentrations ( $>1 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$ ) for 48 hours changed swimming activity and increased activity of cholinesterase and catalase, which are indicative for neurotoxic and oxidative stress (Gambardella et al. 2017). In a study characterizing the size- and shape-dependent effects of microplastic particles, adult daggerblade grass shrimp (*Palaemonetes pugio*) was exposed for 3 h to 30, 35, 59, 75, 83, 116 and 165  $\mu\text{m}$  PE or PS spheres and to 34 and 93  $\mu\text{m}$  PP fragments and to 34 and 93  $\mu\text{m}$  PP fibres at a concentration of 50,000 particles/L (Gray and Weinstein 2017). The results revealed that ingestion and ventilation are the main uptake pathways and that the number of ingested particles is influenced by the shape (i.e. fragments  $>$  spheres  $>$  fibres). The residence time of the particles in the digestive tracts and gills was  $43.0 \pm 13.8$  hours and  $36.9 \pm 5.4$  hours, respectively. Spheres and fragments smaller than 50  $\mu\text{m}$  were not acutely toxic, while for sizes above 50  $\mu\text{m}$  the mortality for the three shapes ranged from 5% to 40%, with a significantly higher mortality (55%) for 93  $\mu\text{m}$  fibres.

Microplastics can act as vectors for adventitious chemical contaminants such as monomers (i.e. the building blocks of plastics), additives (including plasticizers, flame retardants, lubricants, UV-stabilizers, hydrocarbons, antioxidants, as well as intermediates and compounds for dyes and inks) and contaminants absorbed from the environment. The absorption of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), petroleum hydrocarbons, dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane (DDT), organochlorine pesticides (hexachlorocyclohexanes, hexachlorobenzene, chlordanes, and mirex),

organophosphorus esters, and phthalates by plastics materials has been widely documented (Browne et al. 2013; Rochman et al. 2013; Avio et al. 2015; Batel et al. 2016; Jang et al. 2016; Wardrop et al. 2016; Kwon et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2017). A recent study using *Mytilus spp.* found that 7 days of exposure to PS microbeads in combination with fluoranthene resulted in a higher fluoranthene concentration in mussels after 7 days of depuration compared to mussels exposed to fluoranthene alone (Paul-Pont et al. 2016). This phenomenon may be related to direct effects of PS microbeads on detoxification mechanisms, impairment of filtration activity, or to the remaining PS microbeads in the gut (Paul-Pont et al. 2016).

Recent findings indicate that chemicals sorbed to microplastics, such as brominated flame retardants (e.g., PBDEs (Wardrop et al. 2016) and HBCDs (Jang et al. 2016)), nonylphenol, triclosan, PAHs and PCBs, can be transferred to organisms and then trigger adverse effects (Browne et al. 2013; Rochman et al. 2013; Avio et al. 2015). Bioaccumulation of chemical pollutants in marine biota via food web transfer has also been reported (Batel et al. 2016). However, both field and modelling studies suggest that transfer of environmental pollutants through microplastics is negligible compared to other routes of uptake (Gouin et al. 2011; Bakir et al. 2016; Espinosa et al. 2016; Koelmans et al. 2016; Ziccardi et al. 2016; Lohmann 2017; Smith et al. 2018). Nonetheless, caution seems warranted since many of the chemicals sorbed to microplastics are known to be potent toxicants in humans and marine biota, triggering adverse effects such as endocrine disruption, neurological disorders, and reduced reproductive success (GESAMP 2016).

In the marine or coastal environment, microplastics may also interact with microorganisms. For instance, a microcosm experiment from Harrison et al. (2014) investigated the potential of microplastics in sediment to function as sites of attachment for naturally occurring bacteria. The results revealed that LDPE microplastics were colonized within 7 days and that after 14 days, these plastisphere communities were dominated by the genera *Acetobacter* and *Colwellia* (Harrison et al. 2014). The presence of potentially pathogenic hitchhikers such as *Vibrio spp.* was demonstrated on certain types of



microplastics (PE, PP, and PS fragments) and in water collected from North/Baltic Sea (Kesy et al. 2016; Kirstein et al. 2016). From all collected plastic particles, pathogenic bacteria *V. parahaemolyticus* were identified on 12 microplastic fragments. Although the occurrence of microorganism assemblages and hitchhikers has been proved by those studies, the consequences for the respective ecosystems remain unknown.

### Intake of microplastics via human consumption of seafood

Since seafood constitutes an important food source, especially for coastal communities, there is an urgent need to assess the potential risks involved. Estimation of dietary exposure is an important first step. Table 6 presents the estimated intake of microplastics from seafood based on the amounts of seafood consumed globally in 2013 (FAO 2017a) and the concentrations of microplastics reported in Tables 3 and 4. Since the spatial variation in microplastics concentrations is high, even within the same continent, we used the minimum and maximum concentration reported in each continent. The estimated intake can reach up to  $66 \times 10^3$ ,  $28 \times 10^3$  and  $36 \times 10^3$  particles/day through fish, crustacean, and molluscs consumption, respectively (Table 6). This is higher than the values estimated by Vandermeersch et al. (2015) and Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen (2014), which range from 365 up to  $11 \times 10^3$  particles/year (Van Cauwenberghe and Janssen 2014).

Data in Table 6 represents a conservative scenario of dietary exposure to microplastics from fish and shellfish in general. Estimating microplastic intake via fish consumption (Table 6) is complex, because microplastic particles found in fish are mostly found in digestive tracts, which are usually discarded. Degutting can minimize the direct exposure to microplastics. However, small fish species such as anchovies, are eaten whole. Therefore, exposure assessment based on microplastics abundance found in the digestive tract of fish is still important, since data on microplastics found in the tissue of fish are still very limited. This approach is necessary for scientific purpose,

particularly to portray the risk level of microplastics exposure to human at current condition.

## Discussion

### Methodological considerations

The growing research interest in microplastics has resulted in abundant occurrence data on microplastics in the environment and seafood (Tables 1–4). However, the lack of standardized methods and quality assurance protocols hinders interpretation of the results and comparisons between studies. This raises the question whether results are representative and comparable. The establishment of harmonized protocols covering sampling, pre-treatment, analytical techniques and quality assurance is required to obtain unbiased and comparable data on the presence of microplastics in the environment.

### Quality assurance

The omnipresence of (micro)plastics in natural and human environments implies a serious contamination risk during sampling and analysis. For example, synthetic microfibres have been shown to be abundant in both indoor and outdoor air (Dris et al. 2016, 2017), resulting in contaminated samples during microplastics analysis (Wesch et al. 2017). Performing microplastic analysis under clean air conditions has been proven significantly to reduce the abundance of small fibres and give more reliable results (Foekema et al. 2013; Hermesen et al. 2017). Inclusion of blank and spiked samples during analysis is an effective way to assure the validity of the data obtained (Rummel et al. 2016; Hermesen et al. 2017).

Of the 72 papers included in the present review (Tables 1–4), approximately 60% implemented some kind of quality assurance, although the extent of the quality control measures varied substantially between studies. Only 55% of 72 studies ran blank samples, 28% checked background contamination, and 17% ran the combination of blank samples and spiking method or background checking. The development, implementation and harmonization of strict quality assurance criteria are absolutely essential to improve the accuracy of analytical data on microplastics.



Table 5. Laboratory experiments exposing coastal seafood species to microplastics and the observed effects.

Fish	Species	Polymer type & shape	Size	Exposure route: concentration; duration	Endpoint(s)	Observed effect(s)	Reference
	<i>Pomatoschistus microps</i>	PE spheres alone or in combination with gold nanoparticles.	1–5 µm	Water: 0.184 mg L <sup>-1</sup> ; 96 hours	Head and body of individual fish	Exposure to PE spheres did not change uptake and toxicity of gold nanoparticles, nor did it significantly change predatory performance, but it did induce a temperature depend increase of phase I biotransformation activity and oxidative stress.	Ferreira et al. (2016b)
	<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i> larvae	fluorescent PE microbeads	10–45 µm	Dietary: 0, 0.12, and 1.2% (w/w) diet; 7–43 days	Larvae	Significant positive correlation between number of PE beads scored per larvae at 20 days after hatching (dph) and cytochrome P450-1A1 ( <i>cyp1a1</i> ) expression. Exposure to the highest concentration caused a slightly increased mortality, but in general, there was only limited impact of PE microbeads on sea bass larvae.	Mazurais et al. (2015)
	<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i>	PVC (native and polluted)	<0.3 mm	Dietary: 0.1% (w/w) of feed; 90 days	Gut	Gradual histopathological alterations varying from moderate to severe related to exposure times, indicating structural and functional deterioration of in particular the distal part of the gut.	Peda et al. (2016)
	<i>Oryzias latipes</i>	PE (pellets and marine-plastic treatment)	<0.5 mm	Dietary: 10% (w/w) of diet; 1–2 months	Liver and gonads	Decreased chorionogenin (Chg H) gene expression in male fish and decreased vitellogenin (Vtg I). Chg H and estrogen receptor gene expression in female fish suggests the capability of inducing endocrine disrupting effects.	Rochman et al. (2014)
	<i>Carassius carassius</i>	PS-NH <sub>2</sub> amino modified particles	53 and 180 nm	Water: 0.1 g L <sup>-1</sup> (with particles size 180 and 53 nm); 0.029 g L <sup>-1</sup> (particle size 53 nm); 0 g L <sup>-1</sup> (control). The fish were also fed <i>Daphnia magna</i> that had ingested PS particles from contaminated algae (60 individuals to each aquarium consisted of 3 fish). The fish were fed <i>Daphnia magna</i> every 3 days.	Brain	The transfer of NPs through the food chain (from algae through zooplankton to fish) was demonstrated and the accumulation of PS particles caused morphological changes in brain and affected hunting and eating behaviour.	Mattsson et al. (2017)
	<i>Danio rerio</i> (embryo and larvae)	PS nanoparticles	51 nm	Exposure: 67 days Water: 0, 0.1, 1, 10 mg L <sup>-1</sup> 168 hours	embryo and larvae (GI tract, head, gall bladder, liver, pericardium, pancreas)	Migration of PS particles from yolk to other organs throughout embryo development. The exposure of nano-PS to the embryo did not cause significant mortality, morphological deformities and mitochondrial bioenergetics, but decreased the heart rate in embryos and induced larval swimming hypoactivity.	Pitt et al. (2017)
<b>Shellfish</b>	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	PS spheres	30 nm	Water: 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3 mg mL <sup>-1</sup> ; 8 hours	Tissues, pseudofaeces	Increased production of pseudofaeces and reduced filtering activity.	Wegner et al. (2012)
	<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	PS spheres	10, 30, 90 µm	Water: 110 particles/mL; 14 days	Digestive tract	No significant effects on the overall energy budget.	Van Cauwenberghe et al. (2015)

(Continued)





Table 5. (Continued).

Species	Polymer type & shape	Size	Exposure route: concentration; duration	Endpoint(s)	Observed effect(s)	Reference
<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	PS spheres	3, 9.6 $\mu\text{m}$	Water: 0.51 $\text{mg mL}^{-1}$ ; 12 hours	Digestive tract, haemolymph	Translocation to circulatory system within 3 days, with a maximum accumulation at 12 days and persistence for over 48 days. No significant effects on the oxidative status of haemolymph, the viability and phagocytic activity of haemocytes, or filter-feeding activity.	Browne et al. (2008)
<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	HDPE grain	0–80 $\mu\text{m}$	Water: 2.5 $\text{mg mL}^{-1}$ ; 3–96 hours	Digestive tract, haemolymph	Uptake in the stomach, transfer into the digestive gland and accumulation in the lysosomal system; exposure causes inflammatory response in digestive tract demonstrated by granulocytoma formation and lysosomal destabilization	von Moos et al. (2012)
<i>Mytilus edulis</i>	Microfibres	0.05–5 mm	Water: 2,000 microfibres/L; 48 h exposure and 48 h elimination	Gills, gut, stomach, mantle, gonad, adductor, visceral tissues, foot	Microfibers were found in all organs, including organs which are not involved with ingestion. It indicates that the accumulation of microplastics is not only due to ingestion process, but also adherence to the surface of mussel tissues. The highest concentration of microfibers was found in gut, both after exposure (171 particles/g) and elimination (91 particles/g).	Kholandhasamy et al. (2018)
<i>Mytilus galloprovincialis</i>	PE and PS powders (virgin and contaminated with pyrene)	<100 $\mu\text{m}$	Water: 1.5 $\text{g L}^{-1}$ ; 7 days	Haemolymph, digestive glands, and gills	Localization of microplastics in haemolymph, gills and digestive tissues (and pyrene accumulation in the latter); alterations of immunological responses; lysosomal compartment; peroxisomal proliferation; antioxidant system, neurotoxic effects; onset of genotoxicity; changes in gene expression profile.	Avio et al. (2015)
<i>Mytilus spp.</i>	PS microbeads	2 and 6 $\mu\text{m}$	Water: 32 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ (alone) and 30 $\mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ (combination with fluoranthene); 7 days exposure and 7 days depuration	Haemolymph, digestive glands, and gills	A higher fluoranthene concentration was detected in mussels exposed to fluoranthene in combination with micro-PS (after depuration); increased haemocyte mortality; triggered substantial modulation of cellular oxidative balance (increased reactive oxygen species production in haemocytes, and increased anti-oxidant and glutathione-related enzymes in mussel tissues).	Paul-Pont et al. (2016)
<i>Scrobicularia plana</i> (Clam)	PS spheres	20 $\mu\text{m}$	Water: 1 $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ; 14 days followed by 7 days depuration	Haemolymph, gills and digestive glands	PS were not eliminated after 7 days depuration; influenced antioxidant capacity; DNA damage; induced neurotoxicity and oxidative damage	Kesy et al. (2016)

(Continued)



Table 5. (Continued).

Species		Polymer type & shape		Size	Exposure route: concentration; duration		Endpoint(s)	Observed effect(s)		Reference
<i>Crassostrea gigas</i> (Pacific oyster)		PS spheres		2 and 6 µm	Water: 0.023 mg L <sup>-1</sup> ; 2 months		Haemolymph, digestive glands, and gonads	Increased food consumption suggesting increased stress and energy demand to maintain homeostasis; reproductive disruption (significant decreases in oocyte number, diameter and sperm velocity); reduction of offspring performance during larval stages		Sussarellu et al. (2016)
<i>Carcinus maenas</i>		PP fibres		<5 mm	Dietary: 0, 0.3, 0.6, 1%; 4 weeks		Faeces	Reduced food consumption and significant reduction of available energy for growth over 4 weeks in crabs fed with 1% plastic.		Watts et al. (2015)
<i>Uca rapax</i>		PS fragments		180–250 µm	Sediment: 108 and 1000 mg kg <sup>-1</sup> dry sediment; 2 months		gills, stomach,			Ingestion; PS detected in gills, stomach and hepatopancreas; PS in micro size can be translocated from stomach to hepatopancreas. Dietary: 155 mg microparticles (clean or loaded with PCBs) added to about 9.64 g of gelatin feed cubes. The concentration of PCB in each loaded microplastic was 1.35 µg. Exposure: 3 weeks
Brennecke et al. (2015)				<i>Nephrops</i>	<i>norvegicus</i>		PE and PS microspheres (MS) loaded with PCBs	6 µm, 500–600 µm		
Tail tissues	Limited accumulation of PCBs residues in <i>Nephrops norvegicus</i> tail tissues, when fed PCB-spiked PE MS of 500–600 µm. However, no accumulation was observed in case of exposure to PCB-spiked PS MS.	Devriese et al. (2017)								
<i>Atactodea striata</i>		Microgranules PS		63–250 µm	Water: 0, 10, 1000 items/L; 10 days		Faeces and pseudofaeces	Reduced clearance rate at high concentration of PS microgranules (more than two fold). As a consequence, it reduced the energy intake. The respiration rate and absorption efficiency remained stable. At high microplastic concentration, the number microplastics in faeces and pseudofaeces increased.		Xu et al. (2017)

(Continued)



Table 5. (Continued).

Species	Polymer type & shape	Size	Exposure route: concentration; duration	Endpoint(s)	Observed effect(s)	Reference
<i>Daphnia magna</i>	PS-NH <sub>2</sub> Amino modified particles	52, 53, 57, 58, 120, 180 and 330 nm	Water: 0.025–0.150 g L <sup>-1</sup> ; 24 hours	The number of dead <i>D. magna</i> was counted every hour for 24 hours	Only the 52 nm sized particles showed concentration dependent toxicity. The animals were still alive after 24 hours exposed to 0.025 g L <sup>-1</sup> polystyrene particles in water/algae medium. Above 0.075 g L <sup>-1</sup> all animals were dead after 13 hours of exposure.	Mattsson et al. (2017)
<i>Artemia franciscana</i>	PS beads	0.1 µm	Water: 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10 mg L <sup>-1</sup> ; 24 hours	Larvae	PS beads were accumulated in the gut of crustaceans after 24 and 48 hours-exposure. Some of the PS beads were excreted. No significant effect in mortality of larvae was observed. The exposure of PS beads in high concentration (>1 mg L <sup>-1</sup> ) for 48 hours changed swimming activity of crustaceans and indicated the induced of neurotoxic and oxidative stress.	Gambardella et al. (2017)
<i>Palaeomonetes pugio</i>	PS, PE (spheres); PP (fragment and fibre)	Spheres: 165 µm; fragments and fibres (34 and 93 µm)	Water: 50,000 particles/L; 3 hours	Whole body, gut and respiratory chamber	Ingestion and ventilation are the main uptake pathways and the number of ingested particles is influenced by the shape (i.e. fragments > spheres > fibres). The residence time of microplastics in digestive tracts and gills ranged from 27–75 hours and from 27–45 hours respectively. The uptake of microplastics resulted in acute toxicity for crustaceans, indicated by a mortality range from 0%–55%. Particles in the form of 93 µm fibres showed the highest mortality rate.	Gray and Weinstein (2017)
<i>Thylonella gemmata</i> ; <i>Holothuria floridana</i> ; <i>Holothuria grisea</i> ; <i>Cucumaria frondosa</i>	PVC fragment Nylon fragment PVC pellets	0.25–15 mm 0.25–1.5 mm 4.0 mm	Sediment: 10 g PVC fragment/600 ml silica sand, 65 g PVC pellet/600 ml silica sand, 2 g nylon fragment/600 ml silica sand; 4 hours feeding. After the exposure, samples were moved to different tank for 20–25 hours.	faecal pellets, sand grains defecated	All specimen ingested plastic particles (PVC both fragments and pellets, as well as nylon fragments). The sea cucumbers ingested 1.4–20.5 times more PVC fragments than expected (the number of plastics pieces expected to be ingested for a given volume of sand), and ingested 2–138 fold more for nylon line. Two of 4 species can ingest PVC pellets	Graham and Thompson (2009)
<i>Amphibalanus amphitrite</i>	PS beads	0.1 µm	Water: 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10 mg L <sup>-1</sup> ; 24–48 hours	Larvae	PS beads were accumulated in the gut of barnacles at very high concentration (≥ 1 mg L <sup>-1</sup> ) after 24 and 48 hours-exposure, and they did not excrete the particles. No significant effect in mortality of larvae was observed. The exposure of PS beads for 48 hours has induced of neurotoxic and oxidative stress.	Gambardella et al. (2017)

PE: polyethylene, HDPE: high density polyethylene, PP: polypropylene, PS: polystyrene, PVC: polyvinyl chloride

### Standardization

Quality assurance protocols improve reproducibility and representativeness, but do not guarantee comparability of results between studies. The number of variables influencing microplastic measurements is endless. Examples include the mesh size of filters, sampling depth, tissues analysed, destruction techniques, analytical identification techniques and detection limits. The results in [Tables 1–4](#) illustrate this enormous variability, with lower size limits varying from 4.3–1,400  $\mu\text{m}$  (sediment) and 30–500  $\mu\text{m}$  (water column), sampling depth of the water column varying from < 400  $\mu\text{m}$  (surface microlayer) to 4.5 m, identification techniques covering visual inspection, FTIR and Raman spectroscopy, and tissues analysed covering the gastro-intestinal tract/guts/viscera, stomach/gut, gills, muscle/flesh and liver. The need for standardization is widely recognized, e.g. by international organisations such as GESAMP (2016). Standardization should not reduce scientific freedom by restricting the analysis to a limited set of parameters and techniques, but increase comparability between studies by the inclusion of a set of standardized parameters and techniques.

The need for standardization is most urgent for the units in which the amount of microplastics is being reported. Monitoring studies often report the number of particles in a medium without providing details about the mass or volume of these particles ([Tables 1–4](#)). Toxicity studies typically express exposure levels based on the mass of the particles ([Table 5](#)). Both units can be converted, provided particle characteristics (i.e., size, shape and material) are specified. However, determination of the size, shape and material of each individual particle is a time consuming and expensive effort which can be unfeasible in practice. As a bare minimum, monitoring studies should report the total weight and volume of the particles detected, next to the number of particles. This would allow concentrations of microplastics to be expressed in mg of plastics per unit of medium, enhancing the compatibility of results between monitoring and toxicity studies.

### Microplastics in sediment, water, and seafood samples

Our results show that microplastics are widely distributed in the waters, sediments and seafood of

coastal areas around the world ([Tables 1–4](#)). A formal statistical analysis of the spatial patterns in the data and the associations with pollution sources was not performed because of the low number and limited comparability of the data. Nonetheless, high levels of microplastics tend to occur in areas with high population densities, intensive recreation, intensive fisheries, and relatively poor waste management facilities, such as in China (Qiu et al. 2015), Canada (Desforges et al. 2014; Mathalon and Hill 2014), Mexico (Retama et al. 2016), and South Korea (Chae et al. 2015; Song et al. 2015). More data and analyses are needed to confirm these trends and to further explore potential associations with pollution sources and environmental factors such as currents and winds. This endeavour would greatly benefit from the creation of a global database on microplastics detected in water, sediments and organisms, including seafood. Such a global database would also be very useful for the identification of hotspots, and to monitor the impact of mitigation measures. Several non-profit organizations have compiled global data on microplastics (Stöhr 2016; Christiansen 2018), but these initiatives currently lack the scientific details required to explore the relationship between microplastics characteristics (e.g., size, material type, form) and particle behaviour, e.g. dispersion in water, uptake in organisms, trophic transfer and potential toxicity.

The present study reviewed microplastic contamination in a wide range of coastal seafood species ([Tables 3 and 4](#)). The number of microplastics ingested by seafood can be influenced by many factors, such as habitat and feeding behaviour. Our results show that pelagic fish ingest significantly more microplastics than fish from other habitats, which is in line with the results of Rummel et al. (2016) and Guven et al. (2017). Furthermore, our results indicate that fish from sites with a higher abundance of microplastics in water and sediment ingest a higher number of microplastic particles than fish from less polluted sites, which was also found by Li et al. (2016) and Guven et al. (2017). These results indicate that habitat type and the contamination level of the habitat are important determinants in microplastics exposure and accumulation. Feeding behaviour may also affect microplastics ingestion. Non-selective feeders (e.g. mackerels) and deposit

feeders (e.g. sea cucumbers) tend to ingest more microplastics than other seafood, which was also reported in previous studies (Graham and Thompson 2009; Rummel et al. 2016; Taylor et al. 2016).

### ***Toxic effects in seafood species***

Effects of microplastics in coastal fish and shellfish species have been demonstrated in a substantial number of laboratory experiments (Table 5). The effects are observed at all levels of biological organisation, i.e. molecular (e.g., gene expression, oxidative stress, DNA damage), cellular (histopathological alterations, immunological responses, haemocyte mortality, modulation of the oxidative balance), tissue (morphological changes, inflammation, neurotoxicity), functional (reproductive disruption, energy balance) and individual (mortality, behavioural changes). However, the available data do not allow the identification of clear cause and effect pathways. For example, increased gene expression may be triggered by microplastics directly, but it can also be an indirect response. It is even not clear whether the effects observed are the result of the additives and contaminants that leach from the particles, or of the physical impact of the particles themselves. Effects such as inflammation, immunological responses and oxidative stress are often observed after exposure to small particles and attributed to their physical impact (Wright and Kelly 2017), but these effects can also be triggered by chemical stressors (Jeng et al. 2011). Some studies show a clear dose- and time-dependency of the effects observed (Peda et al. 2016; Mattsson et al. 2017), but the establishment of relationships across multiple studies is hampered by the use of different particles (size, shape and material) and exposure regimes. More information on the relationship between microplastics characteristics and their behaviour in the environment is needed to determine which are the most relevant drivers of microplastic toxicity (Horton et al. 2017; Lambert et al. 2017).

### ***Linking monitoring studies to toxicity experiments***

An important risk management question is whether the toxic effects detected in laboratory studies also occur in the field. Since reliable data showing toxicity of microplastics under field conditions are

lacking, this question can only be answered tentatively by linking the results of monitoring studies to those of toxicity experiments under laboratory conditions. As outlined above, this linkage is hampered by the use of different units. However, we tentatively converted the exposure levels reported in the toxicity studies (Table 5) into particle numbers per unit of medium, based on reported particle size, a specific mass of 1 g/ml for microplastics, and assuming particles are either spherical, cylindrical or block-shaped. The results are presented in Table 7.

For exposure through the water phase, the levels applied in the toxicity studies vary between  $10^4$ – $10^{17}$  particles/m<sup>3</sup>. The water concentrations detected in the field are generally much lower, varying between  $10^{-3}$ – $10^5$  particles/m<sup>3</sup> (Table 2), with the highest concentrations measured in subsurface microlayers. The lowest particle concentration at which adverse effects were detected was  $7.46 \times 10^6$  particles/m<sup>3</sup> (von Moos et al. 2012) using grain-sized particles of 0–80 µm. This still is a factor of 50 higher than the highest concentration measured in the surface microlayer and a factor of 800 higher than the highest concentration measured in (sub)surface seawater.

In dietary studies, exposure levels range from  $10^3$ – $10^7$  particles/g food (Table 5), with adverse effects starting at  $2.44 \times 10^6$  particles/g food (Watts et al. 2015). The maximum concentrations found in human seafood (Table 6) are almost a factor of 100,000 lower than the minimum reported effect concentration. For sediment studies, the range in exposure levels used in toxicity experiments is small, i.e.  $1.7$ – $5.4 \times 10^5$  particles/kg sediment. Adverse effects were not reported at these levels (Graham and Thompson 2009; Brennecke et al. 2015). Detected environmental concentrations are at least a factor of 20 lower, varying between 0– $10^4$  particles/kg sediment (Table 1).

It can be concluded that the levels of microplastics detected in the environment tend to be much lower than the exposure levels applied in the laboratory and at which adverse effects in seafood species are being detected. Especially in dietary studies, exposure levels are much higher than the levels detected in the field. Indeed, many of the toxicity studies apply exposure levels a factor of  $10^3$ – $10^9$  higher, triggering questions about the environmental relevance of these studies. Nevertheless, the application of very high exposure levels is a normal practice in

toxicity tests in order to establish the value of no observed adverse effect level (NOAEL) and to derive a margin of safety. In line with Lenz et al. (2016b), we recommend toxicity studies using exposure concentrations as close as possible to field levels, i.e.  $10^0$ – $10^5$  particles/ $\text{m}^3$  for water,  $10^0$ – $10^4$  particles/kg for sediment and  $10^0$ – $10^2$  particles/g food for dietary studies (Tables 1, 2 & 6). These numbers apply to particles in the size range of 20–5,000  $\mu\text{m}$ .

Although the levels detected in the environment tend to be much lower than the effect levels from toxicity experiments, this does not automatically imply current environmental levels are safe for seafood species. One important source of uncertainty is the lower size limit at which particles are being detected in monitoring studies, which varies between 4.3 and 1,400  $\mu\text{m}$  (Tables 1–2). Table 5 shows that particles much smaller than this detection limit, i.e. smaller than 1–10  $\mu\text{m}$ , can already trigger adverse effects. Indeed, many studies tend to use very small size of plastic particles, even in nano sizes. The smallest size is 30 nm, and only one study used larger size microplastics (0.05–5 mm; Kholandhasamy et al. 2018). Although there are indications that the weathering of macroplastics can release very small particles (Lambert and Wagner 2016), their detection in environmental matrices remains a challenge and their fate is uncertain due to processes such as homo- and heteroaggregation (Olubukola et al. 2018). New methods and techniques are required to extract plastic particles smaller than 10  $\mu\text{m}$  from environmental matrices.

Another factor limiting the field relevance of toxicity studies, is the limited representativeness of the particles used. Current experiments are often performed with particles of a single material, the same shape and a limited size range, whereas microplastics detected in environmental samples cover a variety of materials, shapes and sizes. Spheres, beads and pellets are most commonly used in toxicity tests (Table 5), whereas field particles are irregularly shaped as the majority results from the degradation of macroplastics. PP, PE, PS, PET, PA, and PL were the most frequently reported microplastic types in both environmental and seafood samples (Tables 1–4). This finding is in line with the fact that PP, PE (including HDPE and LDPE), PET and PS are among the six most produced

plastics globally (PlasticsEurope 2017). However, toxicity experiments with particles of divergent composition are lacking. One option to increase the field relevance of laboratory toxicity studies is to perform the experiments with microplastic particles extracted from field samples, although it will be a challenge to extract these particles in sufficient quantities and in a representative manner.

### Human health risks

The widespread presence of microplastics in coastal seafood species entails a potential human health risk, although adverse effects at estimated exposure levels (Table 6) seem highly unlikely. Several attempts to assess the risks associated with the presence of microplastics in seafood have been initiated (Brennecke et al. 2015), but most of these are related to the transfer of toxic organic pollutants. A human health risk assessment exclusively based on the effects of microplastics is still lacking.

Quantitative risk assessment is hampered by limited data on the fate and effects of microplastics in humans and related species. Small size microplastics and nano-sized plastics (<150  $\mu\text{m}$ ) have been shown to translocate across the gut epithelium in humans and rodents, resulting in systemic exposure (Browne et al. 2008). Translocation of even larger plastic particles (up to 438  $\mu\text{m}$ ) has been demonstrated in fish (FAO 2017a). However, quantification of the amount of particles being translocated remains a challenge due to lacking data, particularly with regard to degradation and excretion. Based on data obtained from previous studies on the absorption of microparticles in mammals, EFSA (2016) predicts the intestinal absorption of microplastics in humans to be limited ( $\leq 0.3\%$ ). Particle size, composition, surface charge and hydrophilicity are probably the most important factors influencing intestinal absorption (Hussain et al. 2001; Della Torre et al. 2014; EFSA 2016).

Toxicity testing with human cell lines can support human health risk assessment. An example is the study of Schirinzi et al. (2017), who conducted an *in vitro* study exposing cerebral and epithelial human cells (T98G and HeLa, respectively) to PE and PS microspheres. Exposure did not lead to significant reduction of cell viability (i.e., no cytolysis occurred), but the generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS) was induced at a concentration of 10  $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ ;



**Table 6.** Estimated intake of microplastics through seafood consumption for different regions in the world.

Seafood	Region	Seafood consumption (kg/capita/year) <sup>a</sup>	Concentration of microplastics (# particles/g) <sup>b</sup>	Estimation of microplastic intake (particle/capita/year)	
				Minimum	Maximum
Marine fish	America	0.53	0.02–25.9	11	13,727
	Oceania	2.53	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Asia	1.62	0.57–1.85	923	2,997
	Europe	0.53	0.06–2.00	32	1,060
	Africa	0.87	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Global	1.25	0.02–25.9 <sup>c</sup>	25	32,375
Crustacean	America	2.54	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Oceania	3.77	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Asia	1.99	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Europe	1.76	0.18–10.9	317	19,184
	Africa	0.15	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Global	1.79	0.18–10.9 <sup>c</sup>	322	19,511
Molluscs	America	1.64	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Oceania	2.65	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Asia	3.37	0.9–10.5	3,033	<b>35,385</b>
	Europe	1.95	0.2–13.1	390	25,545
	Africa	0.03	NA*	NA*	NA*
	Global	2.5	0.2–13.1 <sup>c</sup>	500	32,750

<sup>a</sup> Based on seafood consumption data in 2013 from FAO (FAO 2017a)

<sup>b</sup> Taken from Tables 3 and 4, the minimum and maximum concentration found in each group from each region

<sup>c</sup> Taken from Tables 3 and 4, the minimum and maximum concentration found in each group from all regions

\* NA (not available) if the microplastic concentration data were not reported in respective regions

indicative of oxidative stress. More studies using human cells exposed to different types and concentrations of microplastics are required for further investigation, especially to determine the type of microplastics that induce toxicity and the concentration at which adverse effects emerge.

Another challenge in conducting quantitative risk assessment of microplastics is the difficulty to carry out an accurate exposure assessment on fish consumption. As described in Table 3, microplastic particles are mostly found in the GI tract or in the stomach of fish. Fish innards are usually discarded during processing and may not directly pose a risk for human health, except for small fish (e.g. anchovies), shellfish such as bivalves and small shrimp that are usually eaten whole. Up till now, only two studies found microplastics in the edible part of fish (Akhbarizadeh et al. 2017a; Karami et al. 2017). However, it must be noted that the detection of microplastic, and in particular nanoplastics in seafood and other foodstuffs, is still in its infancy. Therefore, it can very well be that the currently predicted exposure levels are an underestimation.

Since viscera of fish and bones are used as ingredients for animal feeds (e.g. feed for poultry and fish), indirect human exposure to microplastics via the animal feed route is very likely (Bouwmeester et al. 2015; Rainieri and Barranco 2019) and requires further research.

### Economic impacts

Microplastics may impact seafood stocks, as the particles can be ingested by small organisms at the bottom of the food chain, transferred to higher trophic levels, and can cause a decrease in fish harvest and quality (Van der Meulen et al. 2014; United Nations Environment Programme 2017). The observed toxic effects in fish and shellfish, such as reproductive disruption, reduction of energy for growth, and alteration in hunting and eating behaviour (Table 5), may ultimately result in reduced stocks of important commercial seafood species. The potential economic damage is substantial. A study by Van der Meulen et al. (2014) predicted that microplastics may lead to an annual income loss up to 0.7% every year for UK aquaculture. Assuming this figure applies to the global fishery and aquaculture industry, this would entail a loss of 1.18 million tonnes or 1.95 billion USD in 2015 (FAO 2017b).

Besides the direct effects of microplastics on seafood stocks, the indirect economic impact may even be larger. The lack of data on the presence and toxicity of microplastics creates uncertainty on whether microplastics in seafood can be considered safe or not. Although exposure levels for humans are low and adverse effects highly unlikely, laypeople are getting increasingly worried because of newspaper articles about the detection of microplastics in seafood.



**Table 7.** Estimated particle concentrations (final column) of the lowest exposure levels applied in the toxicity experiments as listed in Table 5.

Study	Size <sup>a</sup>	Shape	Lowest Exposure	Particle concentration
<i>Exposure through the water phase</i>				<i>#/m<sup>3</sup> water</i>
Ferreira et al. (2016b)	1–5 µm	Spheres	0.184 mg L <sup>-1</sup>	1.30·10 <sup>10</sup>
Mattsson et al. (2017)	53 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.029 g L <sup>-1</sup>	3.72·10 <sup>17</sup>
Pitt et al. (2017)	51 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.1 mg L <sup>-1</sup>	1.44·10 <sup>15</sup>
Wegner et al. (2012)	30 nm	Spheres	0.1 mg mL <sup>-1</sup>	7.07·10 <sup>15</sup>
Van Cauwenbergh et al. (2015)	10, 30 & 90 µm	Spheres	110 #/mL	1.10·10 <sup>8</sup>
Browne et al. (2008)	3 & 9.6 µm	Spheres	0.51 mg mL <sup>-1</sup>	1.10–36.1·10 <sup>9</sup>
von Moos et al. (2012)	0–80 µm	Grain <sup>1</sup>	2.5 mg mL <sup>-1</sup>	7.46E+06
Kholandhasamy et al. (2018)	0.05–5 mm	Fibers <sup>2</sup>	2,000 #/L	2.00·10 <sup>6</sup>
Avio et al. (2015)	<100 µm	Powder <sup>1</sup>	1.5 g L <sup>-1</sup>	2.29·10 <sup>10</sup>
Paul-Pont et al. (2016)	2 & 6 µm	Beads <sup>1</sup>	30 µg L <sup>-1</sup>	2.65–71.6·10 <sup>8</sup>
Kesy et al. (2016)	20 µm	Spheres	1 mg L <sup>-1</sup>	2.39·10 <sup>8</sup>
Sussarellu et al. (2016)	2 & 6 µm	Spheres	0.023 mg L <sup>-1</sup>	5.49–20.3·10 <sup>9</sup>
Xu et al. (2017)	63–250 nm	Granules <sup>1</sup>	10 #/L	1.00·10 <sup>4</sup>
Mattsson et al. (2017)	52 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.025 g L <sup>-1</sup>	3.40·10 <sup>17</sup>
Mattsson et al. (2017)	53 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.025 g L <sup>-1</sup>	3.21·10 <sup>17</sup>
Mattsson et al. (2017)	57 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.025 g L <sup>-1</sup>	2.58·10 <sup>17</sup>
Mattsson et al. (2017)	58 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.025 g L <sup>-1</sup>	2.45·10 <sup>17</sup>
Mattsson et al. (2017)	120 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.025 g L <sup>-1</sup>	2.76·10 <sup>16</sup>
Mattsson et al. (2017)	180 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.025 g L <sup>-1</sup>	8.19·10 <sup>15</sup>
Mattsson et al. (2017)	330 nm	Particles <sup>1</sup>	0.025 g L <sup>-1</sup>	1.33·10 <sup>15</sup>
Gambardella et al. (2017)	0.1 µm	Beads <sup>1</sup>	0.001 mg L <sup>-1</sup>	1.91·10 <sup>12</sup>
Gray and Weinstein (2017)	165 µm	Spheres	50,000 #/L	5.00·10 <sup>7</sup>
Gambardella et al. (2017)	0.1 µm	Beads <sup>1</sup>	0.001 mg L <sup>-1</sup>	1.91·10 <sup>12</sup>
<i>Dietary exposure</i>				<i>#/g food</i>
Mazurais et al. (2015)	10–45 µm	Beads <sup>1</sup>	0.12% (w/w)	1.10·10 <sup>7</sup>
Peda et al. (2016)	<0.3 mm	Unknown <sup>1</sup>	0.1% (w/w)	5.66·10 <sup>4</sup>
Rochman et al. (2014)	<0.5 mm	Pellets <sup>3</sup>	10% (w/w)	1.22·10 <sup>6</sup>
Watts et al. (2015)	<5 mm	Fibres <sup>2</sup>	0.3%	2.44·10 <sup>5</sup>
Devriese et al. (2017)	6 µm	Spheres	155 mg/9.64 g cube (= 15.9 mg g <sup>-1</sup> )	1.42·10 <sup>8</sup>
Devriese et al. (2017)	500–600 µm	Spheres	155 mg/9.64 g cube (= 15.9 mg g <sup>-1</sup> )	1.85·10 <sup>2</sup>
<i>Exposure through sediment</i>				<i>#/kg sediment</i>
Brennecke et al. (2015)	180–250 µm	Fragments <sup>4</sup>	108 mg kg <sup>-1</sup>	5.43·10 <sup>5</sup>
Graham and Thompson (2009)	0.25–1.5 mm	Fragments <sup>4</sup>	2 g/600 ml sand <sup>5</sup>	1.66·10 <sup>5</sup>

<sup>a</sup> For spherical particles, size is assumed to represent the diameter; for all other shapes, size is assumed to represent length. If '<' was used, half the maximum value was used for length/diameter; <sup>1</sup> Particles, grains, powders, beads, granules and unknown shapes were assumed spherical; <sup>2</sup> Fibres were assumed to be cylindrical with a 1:100 diameter to length ratio; <sup>3</sup> Pellets were assumed to be cylindrical with a 1:5 diameter to length ratio; <sup>4</sup> Fragments were assumed to be block-shaped with 10:2:1 ratio for length: width: height; <sup>5</sup> For sand, a specific weight of 1.5g mL<sup>-1</sup> was assumed.

As scientists, we can tell people not to worry, but this is a vulnerable strategy. Critics will argue microplastics do not belong in seafood and will point towards lacking exposure and toxicological data, implying we cannot guarantee the safety of our seafood. The raising awareness of microplastics contamination in seafood may thus lead to the less seafood consumption. Stakes are high since the global seafood market is a serious economic factor.

### Management options

Considering the stakes involved, policy makers have to operate carefully and wisely when dealing with microplastics in seafood. Management options are manifold; each with their own pros and cons. Examples include a reduction in the use of plastics, improved waste management, emission reduction,

setting food safety standards and dietary restrictions. Preventive measures tackle the problem at its source, but it takes a long time before such measures result in reduced pollution levels. Dietary restrictions have immediate effect, but may seriously harm the seafood sector. Since microplastics are commonly found in the digestive tracts of seafood, reducing the intake of seafood that is eaten whole (e.g. small fishes like anchovy, edible bivalves, small shrimp), foods prepared with fish viscera, or products from animals raised with fish viscera, will immediately reduce microplastics intake. However, considering the potentially enormous economic impacts, dietary restrictions seem premature as long as toxic effects at current exposure levels have not been demonstrated.

A more realistic option is to set a provisional action level based upon a predetermined percentile,

e.g. the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile, of current detected levels, especially for small fish and shellfish. Action levels are widely used by the United States Food & Drug Administration (USFDA 2000), e.g. for contaminants that do not belong in food, but cannot be avoided. These levels are not based on direct health effects but on aesthetic considerations, e.g. the presence of natural or unavoidable defects in food such as insect larvae and eggs (USFDA 2005). Setting an action level for microplastics in seafood would have some important benefits:

- (1) it will oblige food safety managers to regularly check the presence of microplastics in seafood, resulting in a valuable source of information on current exposure levels;
- (2) it gives a clear signal to the general public that food safety managers take safety seriously and that they are 'on top of it', i.e. by carefully monitoring the developments, allowing interventions if deemed necessary;
- (3) it will give a strong signal to all stakeholders involved in plastic (waste) management, i.e. that plastic pollution in oceans should be prevented because it is potentially threatening a valuable resource, i.e., seafood.

The establishment of a provisional action level for seafood will also have less favourable consequences, particularly economically. It requires regular monitoring of microplastics in seafood with standardized measurement protocols and robust quality control procedures. And if an action level is being exceeded, action should be taken which may vary from long-term remediation options to removing the product from the market (USFDA 2000). The implementation of an action level and determining its numerical value therefore requires careful consideration and requires input from all stakeholders involved.

## Conclusions

The presence of microplastics in coastal areas worldwide is significant and raises serious concerns due to their ability to transfer to coastal seafood. Commercial fish and shellfish in coastal areas have been shown to be contaminated by a wide array of microplastics in terms of types, shapes and sizes. The concentrations found in

seafood tend to correlate with the pollution levels of the environment. It has, furthermore, been demonstrated that microplastics can cause different adverse effects in seafood species and mortality of fish larvae, although the exposure levels were generally orders of magnitude higher than those encountered in the water column and sediments of coastal areas. It is concluded that current data availability is insufficient to perform an adequate risk assessment for microplastics affecting seafood species and human health. Further research is needed that relates the presence of microplastics to potential toxic effects on seafood species and human health, e.g. by using a combination of laboratory experiments with seafood species and *in vitro* assays with human cell lines. The microplastics tested should be similar in shape and size as the ones found in field samples. For now, the presence of microplastics in coastal seafood can be considered a form of unintentional food contamination. Considering the importance of assuring seafood quality and safety, and in the absence of a robust risk-based approach, food safety managers may consider to set a provisional action level for microplastics in seafood. This will be a strong impetus for gathering new data and is a clear signal that microplastics do not belong in seafood.

## Acknowledgments

This project was funded by the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of Republic of Indonesia through Fundamental Research Grant scheme 2017; and supported by Faculty of Management, Science & Technology Open University of the Netherlands and Faculty of Agricultural Technology, Soegijapranata Catholic University, Indonesia.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Funding

This work was supported by the the Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of Republic of Indonesia [011/K6/KM/SP2H/PENELITIAN/2017]; Faculty of Management, Science & Technology Open University, The Netherlands [U2017/1539 JN].

## References

- Akbari E, Alavipanah SK, Jeihouni M, Hajeb M, Haase D, Alavipanah S **2017**. A review of ocean/sea subsurface water temperature studies from remote sensing and non-remote sensing methods. *Water (Switzerland)* [Internet]. 9:936. doi:10.3390/w9120936
- Akhbarizadeh R, Moore F, Keshavarzi B **2017a**. Investigating a probable relationship between microplastics and potentially toxic elements in fish muscles from northeast of Persian Gulf. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 232:154–163. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2017.09.028
- Akhbarizadeh R, Moore F, Keshavarzi B, Moeinpour A **2017b**. Microplastics and potentially toxic elements in coastal sediments of Iran's main oil terminal (Khark Island). *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 220:720–731. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.10.038
- Alomar C, Estarellas F, Deudero S **2016**. Microplastics in the Mediterranean Sea: deposition in coastal shallow sediments, spatial variation and preferential grain size. *Mar Environ Res* [Internet]. 115:1–10. doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2016.01.005
- Alomar C, Sureda A, Capó X, Guijarro B, Tejada S, Deudero S **2017**. Microplastic ingestion by *Mullus surmuletus* Linnaeus, 1758 fish and its potential for causing oxidative stress. *Environ Res* [Internet]. 159:135–142. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.07.043
- Andrady AL **2011**. Microplastics in the marine environment. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 62:1596–1605. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.05.030
- Andrady AL **2015**. Persistence of plastic litter in the oceans. In: Bergman M, Gutow L, Klages M, editors. *Mar Anthropog Litter*. [place unknown]: Springer Open; p. 57–74.
- Au SY, Bruce TF, Bridges WC, Klaine SJ **2015**. Responses of *Hyalella azteca* to acute and chronic microplastic exposures. *Environ Toxicol Chem* [Internet]. 34:2564–2572. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/etc.3093>
- Auta HS, Emenike CU, Fauziah SH **2017**. Distribution and importance of microplastics in the marine environment : A review of the sources, fate, effects, and potential solutions. *Environ Int* [Internet]. 102:165–176. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2017.02.013
- Avio CG, Gorbi S, Milan M, Benedetti M, Fattorini D, D'Errico G, Pauletto M, Bargelloni L, Regoli F **2015**. Pollutants bioavailability and toxicological risk from microplastics to marine mussels. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 198:211–222. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2014.12.021
- Avio CG, Gorbi S, Regoli F **2016**. Plastics and microplastics in the oceans : from emerging pollutants to emerged threat. *Mar Environ Res* [Internet]. 128:2–11. doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2016.05.012
- Bakir A, O'Connor IA, Rowland SJ, Hendriks AJ, Thompson RC **2016**. Relative importance of microplastics as a pathway for the transfer of hydrophobic organic chemicals to marine life. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 219:56–65. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.046
- Barboza LGA, Dick Vethaak A, Lavorante BRBO, Lundebye AK, Guilhermino L **2018**. Marine microplastic debris: an emerging issue for food security, food safety and human health. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 133:336–348. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.05.047
- Barnes DKA, Galgani F, Thompson RC, Barlaz M **2009**. Accumulation and fragmentation of plastic debris in global environments accumulation and fragmentation of plastic debris in global environments. *Philos Trans R Soc B* [Internet]. 364:1985–1998. <http://rstb.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/royptb/364/1526/1985.full.pdf>
- Batel A, Linti F, Scherer M, Erdinger L, Braunbeck T **2016**. Transfer of benzo[a]pyrene from microplastics to *Artemia nauplii* and further to zebrafish via a trophic food web experiment: CYP1A induction and visual tracking of persistent organic pollutants. *Environ Toxicol Chem* [Internet]. 35:1656–1666. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib10.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/etc.3361>
- Bellas J, Martínez-Armental J, Martínez-Cámara A, Besada V, Martínez-Gómez C **2016**. Ingestion of microplastics by demersal fish from the Spanish Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts. *MPB* [Internet]. 109:55–60. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.06.026
- Boucher J, Friot D **2017**. Primary microplastics in the oceans : a global evaluation of sources [Internet]. Gland (Switzerland). <https://nossofuturoroubado.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/IUCN-report-Primary-microplastics-in-the-oceans.pdf>
- Bouwmeester H, Hollman PCH, Peters RJB **2015**. Potential health impact of environmentally released micro- and nano-plastics in the human food production chain: experiences from nanotoxicology. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 49:8932–8947. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/acs.est.5b01090>
- Brate ILN, Eidsvoll DP, Steindal CC, Thomas KV **2016**. Plastic ingestion by Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) from the Norwegian coast. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 112:105–110. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.08.034
- Brennecke D, Ferreira EC, Costa TMM, Appel D, Bernardo AP, Lenz M **2015**. Ingested microplastics (>100 l m) are translocated to organs of the tropical fiddler crab *Uca rapax*. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 96:491–495. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.05.001
- Browne MA, Crump P, Niven SJ, Teuten E, Tonkin A, Galloway T, Thompson R **2011**. Accumulation of microplastic on shorelines worldwide: sources and sinks. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 45:9175–9179. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/es201811s>
- Browne MA, Dissanayake A, Galloway TS, Lowe DM, Thompson RC **2008**. Ingested microscopic plastic translocates to the circulatory system of the Mussel, *Mytilus edulis* (L.). *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 42:5026–5031. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es800249a>
- Browne MA, Niven SJ, Galloway TS, Rowland SJ, Thompson RC **2013**. Microplastic moves pollutants and additives to worms, reducing functions linked to health and biodiversity. *Curr Biol* [Internet]. 23:2388–2392. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2013.10.012
- Carbery M, O'Connor W, Palanisami T **2018**. Trophic transfer of microplastics and mixed contaminants in the marine

- food web and implications for human health. *Environ Int* [Internet]. 115:400–409. doi:[10.1016/j.envint.2018.03.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2018.03.007)
- Carr SA 2017. Sources and dispersive modes of micro-fibers in the environment. *Integr Environ Assess Manag* [Internet]. 13:466–469. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/ieam.1916>
- Castro RO, Silva ML, Regina M, Marques C, de Araújo FV 2016. Evaluation of microplastics in Jurujuba Cove, Niterói, RJ, Brazil, an area of mussels farming. *MPB* [Internet]. 110:555–558. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.05.037](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.05.037)
- Chae DH, Kim IS, Kim SK, Song YK, Shim WJ. 2015. Abundance and distribution characteristics of microplastics in surface seawaters of the Incheon/Kyeonggi coastal region. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* [Internet]. 69:269–278. <https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/article/10.1007%2Fs00244-015-0173-4>
- Cheung PK, Cheung OTL, Fok L 2016. Science of the total environment seasonal variation in the abundance of marine plastic debris in the estuary of a subtropical macro-scale drainage basin in South China. *Sci Total Environ* [Internet]. 562:658–665. doi:[10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.04.048](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.04.048)
- Choi JS, Jung YJ, Hong NH, Hong SH, Park JW 2018. Toxicological effects of irregularly shaped and spherical microplastics in a marine teleost, the sheepshead minnow (*Cyprinodon variegatus*). *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 129:231–240. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.02.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.02.039)
- Christian RR, Baird D, Bowen RE, Clark DM, de Mora S, DiGiacomo PM, Jimenez J, Kineman J, Mazzili S, Servin G, et al. 2005. Coastal GTOS Strategic design and phase 1 implementation plan. FAO [Internet]. [Accessed 2017 Sep 15]. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/a0266e/a0266e07.htm>
- Christiansen KS 2018. Global & gallatin microplastics initiatives [Internet]. [place unknown]. [https://www.adventure-scientists.org/uploads/7/3/9/8/7398741/2018\\_microplastics-report\\_final.pdf](https://www.adventure-scientists.org/uploads/7/3/9/8/7398741/2018_microplastics-report_final.pdf)
- Chubarenko I, Stepanova N 2017. Microplastics in sea coastal zone : lessons learned from the Baltic. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 224:243–254. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2017.01.085](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.01.085)
- Claessens M, De Meester S, Van Landuyt L, De Clerck K, Janssen CR 2011. Occurrence and distribution of microplastics in marine sediments along the Belgian coast. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 62:2199–2204. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.06.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.06.030)
- Cole M, Lindeque P, Halsband C, Galloway TS 2011. Microplastics as contaminants in the marine environment: A review. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 62:2588–2597. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.09.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.09.025)
- Collard F, Gilbert B, Compere P, Eppe G, Das K, Jauniaux T, Parmentier E 2017. Microplastics in livers of European anchovies (*Engraulis encrasicolus*, L.). *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 229:1000–1005. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2017.07.089](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2017.07.089)
- Cunliffe M, Engel A, Frka S, Gašparović BŽ, Guitart C, Murrell JC, Salter M, Stolle C, Upstill-Goddard R, Wurl O 2013. Sea surface microlayers: A unified physico-chemical and biological perspective of the air-ocean interface. *Prog Oceanogr* [Internet]. 109:104–116. doi:[10.1016/j.pocean.2012.08.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2012.08.004)
- Dantas DV, Barletta M, Da Costa MF 2012. The seasonal and spatial patterns of ingestion of polyfilament nylon fragments by estuarine drums (*Sciaenidae*). *Environ Sci Pollut Res* [Internet]. 19:600–606. <https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/article/10.1007%2Fs11356-011-0579-0>
- Davidson K, Dudas SE 2016. Microplastic ingestion by wild and cultured Manila clams (*Venerupis philippinarum*) from Baynes Sound, British Columbia. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* [Internet]. 71:147–156. <https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/article/10.1007%2Fs00244-016-0286-4>
- De Carvalho DG, Neto AB 2016. Microplastic pollution of the beaches of Guanabara Bay, Southeast Brazil. *Ocean Coast Manag* [Internet]. 128:10–17. doi:[10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2016.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2016.04.009)
- De Witte B, Devriese L, Bekaert K, Hoffman S, Vandermeersch G, Cooreman K, Robbens J 2014. Quality assessment of the blue mussel (*Mytilus edulis*): comparison between commercial and wild types. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 85:146–155. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.06.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.06.006)
- Defosse JM, Hawkins AJS 1997. Selective feeding in shellfish: size-dependent rejection of large particles within pseudofaeces from *Mytilus edulis*, *Ruditapes philippinarum* and *tapes decussatus*. *Mar Biol* [Internet]. 129:139–147. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1007/s002270050154>
- Della Torre C, Bergami E, Salvati A, Faleri C, Cirino P, Dawson KA, Corsi I 2014. Accumulation and embryotoxicity of polystyrene nanoparticles at early stage of development of Sea Urchin Embryos *Paracentrotus lividus*. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 48:12302–12311. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/ipdf/10.1021/es502569w>
- Desforges JW, Galbraith M, Dangerfield N, Ross PS 2014. Widespread distribution of microplastics in subsurface seawater in the NE Pacific Ocean. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 79:94–99. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.12.035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.12.035)
- Devriese LI, De Witte B, Vethaak AD, Hostens K, Leslie HA 2017. Chemosphere Bioaccumulation of PCBs from microplastics in Norway lobster (*Nephrops norvegicus*): an experimental study. *Chemosphere* [Internet]. 186:10–16. doi:[10.1016/j.chemosphere.2017.07.121](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2017.07.121)
- Devriese LI, van der Meulen MD, Maes T, Bekaert K, Paul-Pont I, Frère L, Robbens J, Vethaak AD 2015. Microplastic contamination in brown shrimp (*Crangon crangon*, Linnaeus 1758) from coastal waters of the Southern North Sea and channel area. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 98:179–187. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.06.051](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.06.051)
- Dris R, Gasperi J, Mirande C, Mandin C, Guerrouache M, Langlois V, Tassin B 2017. A first overview of textile fibers, including microplastics, in indoor and outdoor environments. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 221:453–458. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2016.12.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.12.013)



- Dris R, Gasperi J, Saad M, Mirande C, Tassin B **2016**. Synthetic fibers in atmospheric fallout: A source of microplastics in the environment? *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 104:290–293. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.01.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.01.006)
- EFSA CONTAM Panel (EFSA Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain). **2016**. Presence of microplastics and nanoplastics in food, with particular focus on seafood EFSA panel on contaminants in the food chain (CONTAM). EFSA J [Internet]. 14:4501. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2016.12.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.12.013)
- Espinosa C, Esteban MÁ, Cuesta A **2016**. Microplastics in aquatic environments and their toxicological implications for fish. In: Larramendy M, editor. *Toxicol - new Asp to this Sci Conundrum* [Internet]. [place unknown]: IntechOpen; p. 113–145. doi:[10.5772/64815](https://doi.org/10.5772/64815)
- [FAO] Food and Agriculture Organization. **2016a**. FAO year-book of fishery and aquaculture statistics 2014 [Internet]. Rome. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5716t.pdf>
- [FAO] Food and Agriculture Organization. **2016b**. The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2016. Contributing to food security and nutrition for all [Internet]. Rome. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i5555e.pdf>
- [FAO] Food and Agriculture Organization. **2017a**. FAOSTAT [Internet]. <http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/CL>
- [FAO] Food and Agriculture Organization. **2017b**. Statistics fisheries and aquaculture statistics 2015 [Internet]. Rome. <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7989t.pdf>
- Farrell P, Nelson K **2013**. Trophic level transfer of microplastic: *Mytilus edulis* (L.) to *Carcinus maenas* (L.). *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 177:1–3. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2013.01.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2013.01.046)
- Fauziah SH, Liyana IA, Agamuthu P **2015**. Plastic debris in the coastal environment : the invincible threat? Abundance of buried plastic debris on Malaysian beaches. *Waste Manag Res* [Internet]. 33:812–821. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1177/0734242X15588587>
- Ferreira GVB, Barletta M, Lima ARA, Dantas DV, Justino AKS, Costa MF **2016a**. Original article plastic debris contamination in the life cycle of *Acoupa weakfish* (*Cynoscion acoupa*) in a tropical estuary. *ICES J Mar Sci* [Internet]. 73:2695–2707. doi:[10.1093/icesjms/fsw108%0A](https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsw108%0A)
- Ferreira P, Fonte E, Soares ME, Carvalho F, Guilhermino L **2016b**. Effects of multi-stressors on juveniles of the marine fish *Pomatoschistus microps* : gold nanoparticles, microplastics and temperature. *Aquat Toxicol* [Internet]. 170:89–103. doi:[10.1016/j.aquatox.2015.11.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquatox.2015.11.011)
- Ferrer MC, Ventero A, Iglesias M, Deudero S, Español I, Centro DO, De Balears O **2016**. Microplastic ingestion in commercial species boops boops, *Sardina pilchardus* and *Engraulis encrasicolus* in the western Mediterranean sea: medias survey. *Rapp Comm Int Mer Medit* [Internet]. 41:218. [http://ciesm.org/online/archives/abstracts/pdf/41/CIESM\\_Congress\\_2016\\_Kiel\\_article\\_0218.pdf](http://ciesm.org/online/archives/abstracts/pdf/41/CIESM_Congress_2016_Kiel_article_0218.pdf)
- Foekema EM, De Gruijter C, Mergia MT, Andries Van Franeker J, Murk AJ, Koelmans AA **2013**. Plastic in North Sea Fish. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. [accessed 2017 Mar 13]; 47:8818–8824. <http://pubs.acs.org.ezproxy.elib10.ub.unimaas.nl/doi/pdf/10.1021/es400931b>
- Fok L, Cheung PK, Tang G, Li WC **2017**. Size distribution of stranded small plastic debris on the coast of Guangdong, South China. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 220:407–412. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.079](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.079)
- Frias JPGL, Gago J, Otero V, Sobral P **2016**. Microplastics in coastal sediments from Southern Portuguese shelf waters. *Mar Environ Res* [Internet]. 114:24–30. doi:[10.1016/j.marenvres.2015.12.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2015.12.006)
- Frias JPGL, Nash R **2019**. Microplastics: finding a consensus on the definition. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 138:145–147. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.11.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2018.11.022)
- Frias JPGL, Otero V, Sobral P **2014**. Evidence of microplastics in samples of zooplankton from Portuguese coastal waters. *Mar Environ Res* [Internet]. 95:89–95. doi:[10.1016/j.marenvres.2014.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2014.01.001)
- Frydkjær CK, Iversen N, Roslev P **2017**. Ingestion and egestion of microplastics by the Cladoceran *Daphnia magna*: effects of regular and irregular shaped plastic and sorbed phenanthrene. *Bull Environ Contam Toxicol* [Internet]. 99:655–661. doi:[10.1007/s00128-017-2186-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00128-017-2186-3)
- Galgani F, Hanke G, Maes T **2015**. Global distribution, composition and abundance of marine litter. In: Bergmann M, Gutow L, Klages M, editors. *Mar Anthropog Litter* [Internet]. [place unknown]: Springer Open; p. 29–56. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-16510-3\\_2](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-16510-3_2)
- Gamage G, Thushari N, Duminda J, Senevirathna M, Yakupitiyage A, Chavanich S **2017**. Effects of microplastics on sessile invertebrates in the eastern coast of Thailand : an approach to coastal zone conservation. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 0–1p. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.06.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.06.010)
- Gambardella C, Morgana S, Ferrando S, Bramini M, Piazza V, Costa E, Garaventa F, Faimali M **2017**. Ecotoxicology and environmental safety Effects of polystyrene microbeads in marine planktonic crustaceans. *Ecotoxicol Environ Saf* [Internet]. 145:250–257. doi:[10.1016/j.ecoenv.2017.07.036](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoenv.2017.07.036)
- [GESAMP] Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection. **2016**. Sources, fate and effects of microplastics in the marine environment: part 2 of a global assessment. Reports Stud GESAMP [Internet]. 93:96. issn: 1020-4873%5Cn. [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/marine/good-environmental-status/descriptor-10/pdf/GESAMP\\_microplasticsfullstudy.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/marine/good-environmental-status/descriptor-10/pdf/GESAMP_microplasticsfullstudy.pdf)
- Gouin T, Roche N, Lohmann R, Hodges G **2011**. A thermodynamic approach for assessing the environmental exposure of chemicals absorbed to microplastic. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 45:1466–1472. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/abs/10.1021/es1032025>
- Graca B, Szwec K, Zakrzewska D, Dołęga A, Szczerbowska-Boruchowska M **2017**. Sources and fate of microplastics in marine and beach sediments of the Southern Baltic Sea—a preliminary study. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* [Internet]. 2014:1–12. <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11356-017-8419-5>

- Graham ER, Thompson JT 2009. Deposit- and suspension-feeding sea cucumbers (Echinodermata) ingest plastic fragments. *J Exp Mar Bio Ecol* [Internet]. 368:22–29. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2008.09.007
- Gray AD, Weinstein JE 2017. Size- and shape-dependent effects of microplastic particles on adult daggerblade grass shrimp (*Palaemonetes pugio*). *Environ Toxicol Chem* [Internet]. 36:3074–3080. doi:10.1002/etc.3881
- Güven O, Gökdağ K, Jovanovic B, Erkan Kideys A 2017. Microplastic litter composition of the Turkish territorial waters of the Mediterranean Sea, and its occurrence in the gastrointestinal tract of fish. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 223:286–294. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2017.01.025
- Harrison JP, Schratzberger M, Sapp M, Osborn AM 2014. Rapid bacterial colonization of low-density polyethylene microplastics in coastal sediment microcosms. *BMC Microbiol* [Internet]. 14:232. <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2180/14/232%5Cnhttp://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-84907441171&partnerID=tZOTx3yl>
- Hartmann NB, Rist S, Bodin J, Jensen LHS, Schmidt SN, Mayer P, Meibom A, Baun A 2017. Microplastics as vectors for environmental contaminants: exploring sorption, desorption, and transfer to biota. *Integr Environ Assess Manag*. 13:488–493.
- Hazimah N, Nor M, Obbard JP 2014. Microplastics in Singapore's coastal mangrove ecosystems. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 79:278–283. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.11.025
- Hermesen E, Pompe R, Besseling E, Koelmans AA 2017. Detection of low numbers of microplastics in North Sea fish using strict quality assurance criteria. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 122:253–258. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.06.051
- Hidalgo-Ruz V, Gutow L, Thompson RC, Thiel M 2012. Microplastics in the marine environment: a review of the methods used for identification and quantification. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 46:3060–3075. <https://macaulay.cuny.edu/eportfolios/branco2014/files/2014/08/hidalgoruzetalENVIRONNMTLSCITECHNOL2012.pdf>
- Horton AA, Walton A, Spurgeon DJ, Lahive E, Svendsen C 2017. Microplastics in freshwater and terrestrial environments: evaluating the current understanding to identify the knowledge gaps and future research priorities. *Sci Total Environ* [Internet]. 586:127–141. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.01.190
- Hussain N, Jaitley V, Florence AT 2001. Recent advances in the understanding of uptake of microparticulates across the gastrointestinal lymphatics. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* [Internet]. 50:107–142. doi:10.1016/S0169-409X(01)00152-1
- Isobe A, Kubo K, Tamura Y, Nakashima E, Fujii N 2014. Selective transport of microplastics and mesoplastics by drifting in coastal waters. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 89:324–330. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.09.041
- Isobe A, Uchida K, Tokai T, Iwasaki S 2015. East Asian seas : A hot spot of pelagic microplastics. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 101:618–623. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.10.042
- Jabeen K, Su L, Li J, Yang D, Tong C, Shi H 2017. Microplastics and mesoplastics in fish from coastal and fresh waters of China. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 221:141–149. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.11.055
- Jambeck JR, Geyer R, Wilcox C, Siegler TR, Perryman M, Andrady A, Narayan R, Law KL 2015. Plastic waste inputs from land into the ocean. *Sci Mag* [Internet]. 347:768–771. <http://science.sciencemag.org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/content/347/6223/768>
- Jang M, Shim WJ, Han GM, Rani M, Song YK, Hong SH 2016. Styrofoam debris as a source of hazardous additives for marine organisms. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 50:4951–4960. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.5b05485>
- Jeng HA, Chih HP, Diawara N, Guo P-C-C, Wen YL, Chia TH, Chi KH, Ming TW 2011. Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon-induced oxidative stress and lipid peroxidation in relation to immunological alteration. *Occup Environ Med* [Internet]. 68:653–658. <http://ir.lib.kmu.edu.tw/retrieve/15043/960021-3.pdf>
- Jovanović B 2017. Ingestion of microplastics by fish and its potential consequences from a physical perspective. *Integr Environ Assess Manag* [Internet]. 13:510–515. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/ieam.1913>
- Karami A, Golieskardi A, Ho YB, Larat V, Salamatinia B 2017. Microplastics in eviscerated flesh and excised organs of dried fish. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 1–9. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-05828-6
- Keszy K, Oberbeckmann S, Müller F, Labrenz M 2016. Polystyrene influences bacterial assemblages in *Arenicola marina*-populated aquatic environments in vitro. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 219:219–227. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.10.032
- Kholandhasamy P, Lei S, Jiana L, Xiaoyun Q, Khalida J, Huahong S 2018. Adherence of microplastics to soft tissue of mussels: A novel way to uptake microplastics beyond ingestion. *Sci Total Environ* [Internet]. 610–611:635–640. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.08.053
- Kim IS, Chae DH, Kim SK, Choi SB, Woo SB 2015. Factors influencing the spatial variation of microplastics on high-tidal coastal beaches in Korea. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* [Internet]. 69:299–309. doi:10.1007/s00244-015-0155-6
- Kirstein IV, Kirmizi S, Wichels A, Garin-Fernandez A, Erler R, Löder M, Gerdt G 2016. Dangerous hitchhikers? Evidence for potentially pathogenic *Vibrio* spp. on microplastic particles. *Mar Environ Res* [Internet]. 120:1–8. doi:10.1016/j.marenvres.2016.07.004
- Koelmans AA, Bakir A, Burton GA, Janssen CR 2016. Microplastic as a vector for chemicals in the aquatic environment: critical review and model-supported reinterpretation of empirical studies. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 50:3315–3326. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/ieam.1901>
- Kripa V, Nair PG, Dhanya AM, Pravitha VP, Abhilash KS, Mohammed AA, Vijayan D, Vishu PG, Mohan G, Kumar APS, et al. 2014. Microplastics in the gut of anchovies caught from the mud bank area of. *Mar Fish Inf Serv Tech Ext Ser* [Internet]. 219:27–28. <http://eprints.cmfri.org.in/10132>

- Kunz A, Walther BA, Löwemark L, Lee YC **2016**. Distribution and quantity of microplastic on sandy beaches along the northern coast of Taiwan. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 111:126–135. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.07.022](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.07.022)
- Kwon J-H, Chang S, Hong SH, Shim WJ **2017**. Microplastics as a vector of hydrophobic contaminants: importance of hydrophobic additives. *Integr Environ Assess Manag* [Internet]. 13:494–499. doi:[10.1002/ieam.1906](https://doi.org/10.1002/ieam.1906)
- Laglbauer BJL, Franco-Santos RM, Andreu-Cazenave M, Brunelli L, Papadatou M, Palatinus A, Grego M, Deprez T **2014**. Macrodebris and microplastics from beaches in Slovenia. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 89:356–366. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.09.036](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.09.036)
- Lambert S, Scherer C, Wagner M **2017**. Ecotoxicity testing of microplastics: considering the heterogeneity of physico-chemical properties. *Integr Environ Assess Manag* [Internet]. 13:470–475. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/ieam.1901>
- Lambert S, Wagner M **2016**. Chemosphere characterisation of nanoplastics during the degradation of polystyrene. *Chemosphere* [Internet]. 145:265–268. doi:[10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.11.078](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2015.11.078)
- Law KL, Thompson RC **2014**. Microplastics in the seas. *Science* [Internet]. 345:144–145. <http://science.sciencemag.org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/content/345/6193/144.full>
- Lebreton LCM, Van Der Zwet J, Damsteeg J-W, Slat B, Andrady A, Reisser J **2017**. River plastic emissions to the world's oceans. *Nat Commun* [Internet]. 8:1–10. doi:[10.1038/ncomms15611](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15611)
- Lenz R, Enders K, Beer S, Sørensen TK, Stedmon CA **2016a**. Analysis of microplastic in the stomachs of herring and cod from the North Sea and Baltic [Internet]. [place unknown]. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Thomas\\_Sorensen6/publication/302423216\\_Analysis\\_of\\_microplastic\\_in\\_the\\_stomachs\\_of\\_herring\\_and\\_cod\\_from\\_the\\_North\\_Sea\\_and\\_Baltic\\_Sea/links/5730714208ae744151911fcc.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Thomas_Sorensen6/publication/302423216_Analysis_of_microplastic_in_the_stomachs_of_herring_and_cod_from_the_North_Sea_and_Baltic_Sea/links/5730714208ae744151911fcc.pdf)
- Lenz R, Enders K, Gissel T **2016b**. Microplastic exposure studies should be environmentally realistic. *PNAS* [Internet]. 113:E4121–4122. [www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1606615113](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1606615113)
- Leslie HA, Brandsma SH, Van Velzen MJM, Vethaak AD **2017**. Microplastics en route : field measurements in the Dutch river delta and Amsterdam canals, wastewater treatment plants, North Sea sediments and biota. *Environ Int* [Internet]. 101:133–142. doi:[10.1016/j.envint.2017.01.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2017.01.018)
- Li J, Qu X, Su L, Zhang W, Yang D, Kolandhasamy P, Li D, Shi H **2016**. Microplastics in mussels along the coastal waters of China \*. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 214:177–184. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2016.04.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.04.012)
- Li J, Yang D, Li L, Jabeen K, Shi H **2015**. Microplastics in commercial bivalves from China. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 207:190–195. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2015.09.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2015.09.018)
- Liboiron M, Liboiron F, Wells E, Richárd N, Zahara A, Mather C, Bradshaw H, Murichi J **2016**. Low plastic ingestion rate in Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) from Newfoundland destined for human consumption collected through citizen science methods. *MPB* [Internet]. 113:428–437. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.10.043](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.10.043)
- Ling SD, Sinclair M, Levi CJ, Reeves SE, Edgar GJ **2017**. Ubiquity of microplastics in coastal sea floor sediments. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 121:104–110. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.05.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.05.038)
- Lohmann R **2017**. Microplastics are not important for the cycling and bioaccumulation of organic pollutants in the Oceans — but should microplastics be considered POPs themselves? *Integr Environ Assess Manag* [Internet]. 13:460–465. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/ieam.1914>
- Lozoya JP, Teixeira de Mello F, Carrizo D, Weinstein F, Olivera Y, Cedres F, Pereira M, Fossati M **2016**. Plastics and microplastics on recreational beaches in Punta del Este (Uruguay): unseen critical residents? *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 218:931–941. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2016.08.0410269-7491/©](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.08.0410269-7491/©)
- Lusher AL, McHugh M, Thompson RC **2013**. Occurrence of microplastics in the gastrointestinal tract of pelagic and demersal fish from the English channel. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 67:94–99. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.11.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2012.11.028)
- Martins J, Sobral P **2011**. Plastic marine debris on the Portuguese coastline : A matter of size? *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 62:2649–2653. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.09.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.09.028)
- Mathalon A, Hill P **2014**. Microplastic fibers in the intertidal ecosystem surrounding Halifax Harbor, Nova Scotia. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 81:69–79. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.02.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2014.02.018)
- Mattsson K, Hansson L-A, Cedervall T **2015**. Nano-plastics in the aquatic environment. *Environ Sci Process Impacts* [Internet]. 17:1712–1721. <https://pubs.rsc.org/en/content/getauthorversionpdf/c5em00227c>
- Mattsson K, Johnson EV, Malmendal A, Linse S, Hansson L-A, Cedervall T **2017**. Brain damage and behavioural disorders in fish induced by plastic nanoparticles delivered through the food chain. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 7:11452. <http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-017-10813-0>
- Mazurais D, Ernande B, Quazuguel P, Severe A, Huelvan C, Madec L, Mouchel O, Soudant P, Robbens J, Huet A, et al. **2015**. Evaluation of the impact of polyethylene microbeads ingestion in European sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) larvae. *MERE* [Internet]. 112:78–85. doi:[10.1016/j.marenvres.2015.09.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2015.09.009)
- Mcgoran AR, Clark PF, Morritt D **2017**. Presence of microplastic in the digestive tracts of European flounder, *Platichthys flesus*, and European smelt, *Osmerus eperlanus*, from the River Thames\*. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 220:744–751. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.078](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.09.078)
- Miliou A, Mentzel S, Almeida M, Maridakis C, Cox R **2016**. Microplastic fibre presence in the food chain of *Sphyrna viridensis* in the Eastern Aegean Sea, Greece. *Rapp Comm Int Mer Medit* [Internet]. 41:222. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/es302332w>
- Murray F, Cowie PR **2011**. Plastic contamination in the decapod crustacean *Nephrops norvegicus* (Linnaeus,



- 1758). *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 62:1207–1217. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.03.032
- Nadal MA, Alomar C, Deudero S 2016. High levels of microplastic ingestion by the semipelagic fish bogue boops boops (L.) around the Balearic Islands. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 214:517–523. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.04.054
- Naidoo T, Smit AJ, Glassom D 2016. Plastic ingestion by estuarine mullet *Mugil cephalus* (Mugilidae) in an urban harbour, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *African J Mar Sci* [Internet]. 38:145–149. doi: 10.2989/1814232X.2016.1159616
- Naji A, Esmaili Z, Khan FR 2016. Plastic debris and microplastics along the beaches of the Strait of Hormuz, Persian Gulf. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 114:1057–1062. <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0025326X16309523>
- Nel HA, Froneman PW 2015. A quantitative analysis of microplastic pollution along the south-eastern coastline of South Africa. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 101:274–279. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.09.043
- Neves D, Sobral P, Lia J, Pereira T 2015. Ingestion of microplastics by commercial fish off the Portuguese coast. *MPB* [Internet]. 101:119–126. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.11.008
- Ogonowski M, Wenman V, Danielsson S, Gorokhova E 2017. Ingested microplastic is not correlated to HOC concentrations in Baltic Sea herring. In: CEST [Internet]. Rhodes (Greece). [https://cest.gnest.org/sites/default/files/presentation\\_file\\_list/cest2017\\_00690\\_oral\\_paper.pdf](https://cest.gnest.org/sites/default/files/presentation_file_list/cest2017_00690_oral_paper.pdf)
- Olubukola SA, Budarz JF, Hernandez LM, Tufenkji N 2018. Microplastics and nanoplastics in aquatic environments: aggregation, deposition, and enhanced contaminant transport. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 52:1704–1724. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/ipdf/10.1021/acs.est.7b05559>
- Ory NC, Sobral P, Ferreira JL, Thiel M 2017. Science of the total environment amberstripe scad *Decapterus muroadsi* (Carangidae) fish ingest blue microplastics resembling their copepod prey along the coast of Rapa Nui (Easter Island) in the South Pacific subtropical gyre. *Sci Total Environ* [Internet]. 586:430–437. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.01.175
- Paul-Pont I, Laccroix C, Fernandez CG, Hegaret H, Lambert C, Le Goic N, Frere L, Cassone A-L, Sussarellu R, Fabioux C, et al. 2016. Exposure of marine mussels *Mytilus* spp. to polystyrene microplastics : toxicity and influence on fluoranthene bioaccumulation \*. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 216:724–737. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.06.039
- Pazos RS, Maiztegui T, Colautti DC, Paracampo AH, Gómez N 2017. Microplastics in gut contents of coastal freshwater fish from Río de la Plata estuary. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 122:85–90. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.06.007
- Peda C, Caccamo L, Fossi MC, Gai F, Andaloro F, Genovese L, Perdichizzi A, Romeo T, Maricchiolo G 2016. Intestinal alterations in European sea bass *Dicentrarchus labrax* (Linnaeus, 1758) exposed to microplastics : preliminary results \*. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 212:251–256. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2016.01.083
- Phillips MB, Bonner TH 2015. Occurrence and amount of microplastic ingested by fishes in watersheds of the Gulf of Mexico. *MPB* [Internet]. 100:264–269. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.08.041
- Phuong NN, Poirier L, Pham QT, Lagarde F, Zalouk-Vergnoux A 2017. Factors influencing the microplastic contamination of bivalves from the French Atlantic coast : location, season and/or mode of life? *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]:0–1. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.10.054
- Pitt JA, Kozal JS, Jayasundara N, Massarsky A, Trevisan R, Geitner N, Wiesner M, Levin ED, Di Giulio RT 2017. Uptake, tissue distribution, and toxicity of polystyrene nanoparticles in developing zebrafish (*Danio rerio*). *Aquat Toxicol* [Internet]. <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0166445X17303442>
- PlasticsEurope. 2017. Plastics-the facts 2017, an analysis of European plastics production, demand and waste data [Internet]. [place unknown]. [https://www.plasticseurope.org/application/files/5715/1717/4180/Plastics\\_the\\_facts\\_2017\\_FINAL\\_for\\_website\\_one\\_page.pdf](https://www.plasticseurope.org/application/files/5715/1717/4180/Plastics_the_facts_2017_FINAL_for_website_one_page.pdf)0Ahttp://www.plasticseurope.org/
- Potthoff A, Oelschlägel K, Schmitt-Jansen M, Rummel CD, Kühnel D 2017. From the sea to the laboratory: characterization of microplastic as prerequisite for the assessment of ecotoxicological impact. *Integr Environ Assess Manag*. 13:500–504.
- Powell JJ, Faria N, Thomas-McKay E, Pele LC 2010. Origin and fate of dietary nanoparticles and microparticles in the gastrointestinal tract. *J Autoimmun* [Internet]. 34:J226–J233. doi:10.1016/j.jaut.2009.11.006
- Qiu Q, Peng J, Yu X, Chen F, Wang J, Dong F 2015. Occurrence of microplastics in the coastal marine environment: first observation on sediment of China. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 98:274–280. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.07.028
- Rainieri S, Barranco A 2019. Microplastics, a food safety issue? *Trends Food Sci Technol* [Internet]. 84:55–57. doi:10.1016/j.tifs.2018.12.009
- Reisser J, Shaw J, Wilcox C, Hardesty BD, Proietti M, Thums M, Pattiaratchi C 2013. Marine plastic pollution in waters around Australia: characteristics, concentrations, and pathways. *PLoS One* [Internet]. 8. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0080466
- Retama I, Jonathan MP, Shruti VC, Velumani S, Sarkar SK, Roy PD, Rodriguez-Espinosa PF 2016. Microplastics in tourist beaches of Huatulco Bay, Pacific coast of southern Mexico. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 113:530–535. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.08.053
- Rochman CM, Hoh E, Kurobe T, Teh SJ 2013. Ingested plastic transfers hazardous chemicals to fish and induces hepatic stress. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 3:3263. <http://www.nature.com/articles/srep03263>
- Rochman CM, Kurobe T, Flores I, Teh SJ 2014. Early warning signs of endocrine disruption in adult fish from the ingestion of polyethylene with and without sorbed chemical pollutants from the marine environment. *Sci Total Environ* [Internet]. 493:656–661. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.06.051

- Rochman CM, Tahir A, Williams SL, Baxa DV, Lam R, Miller JT, Teh F, Werorilangi S, Teh SJ **2015**. Anthropogenic debris in seafood : plastic debris and fibers from textiles in fish and bivalves sold for human consumption. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 5:14340. doi:10.1038/srep14340
- Romeo T, Pietro B, Pedà C, Consoli P, Andaloro F, Cristina M **2015**. First evidence of presence of plastic debris in stomach of large pelagic fish in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 95:358–361. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.04.048
- Rummel CD, Löder MGJ, Fricke NF, Lang T, Griebeler E, Janke M, Gerdtz G **2016**. Plastic ingestion by pelagic and demersal fish from the North Sea and Baltic Sea. *MPB* [Internet]. 102:134–141. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.11.043
- Ryan PG, Moore CJ, van Franeker JA, Moloney CL **2009**. Monitoring the abundance of plastic debris in the marine environment. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci* [Internet]. [accessed 2017 Jun 9]; 364:1999–2012. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov.ezproxy.elib10.ub.unimaas.nl/pmc/articles/PMC2873010/pdf/rstb20080207.pdf>
- Santana MFM, Ascer LG, Custódio MR, Moreira FT, Turra A **2016**. Microplastic contamination in natural mussel beds from a Brazilian urbanized coastal region : rapid evaluation through bioassessment. *MPB* [Internet]. 106:183–189. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.02.074
- Santana MFM, Moreira FT, Turra A **2017**. Trophic transfer of microplastics under a low exposure scenario : insights on the likelihood of particle cascading along marine food-webs. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 121:154–159. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.05.061
- Santillo D, Miller K, Johnston P **2017**. Microplastics as contaminants in commercially important seafood species. *Integr Environ Assess Manag* [Internet]. 13:516–521. <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ieam.1909>
- Schirizzi GF, Pérez-Pomeda I, Sanchís J, Rossini C **2017**. Cytotoxic effects of commonly used nanomaterials and microplastics on cerebral and epithelial human cells. *Environ Res* [Internet]. 159:579–587. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2017.08.043
- Setälä O, Fleming-Lehtinen V, Lehtiniemi M **2014**. Ingestion and transfer of microplastics in the planktonic food web. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 185:77–83. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2013.10.013
- Smith M, Love DC, Rochman CM, Neff RA **2018**. Microplastics in seafood and the implications for human health. *Curr Environ Health Rep* [Internet]:375–386. doi:10.1007/s40572-018-0206-z 5
- Song YK, Hong SH, Jang M, Han GM, Shim WJ **2015**. Occurrence and distribution of microplastics in the sea surface microlayer in Jinhae Bay, South Korea. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* [Internet]. 69:279–287. <https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/article/10.1007%2Fs00244-015-0209-9>
- Stöhr R **2016**. Microplastic in the sea. A research approach by one Earth – one Ocean structure [Internet]. [place unknown]. <https://oneearth-oneocean.com/wp-content/uploads/Microplastic-in-the-sea-report-I.pdf>
- Stolte A, Forster S, Gerdtz G, Schubert H **2015**. Microplastic concentrations in beach sediments along the German Baltic coast. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 99:216–229. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2015.07.022
- Sussarellu R, Suquet M, Thomas Y, Lambert C, Fabioux C, Eve M, Pernet J **2016**. Oyster reproduction is affected by exposure to polystyrene microplastics. *PNAS* [Internet]. 113:2430–2435. [www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1519019113](http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1519019113)
- Syakti AD, Bouhroum R, Hidayati NV, Koenawan CJ, Boulkamh A, Sulisty I, Lebarillier S, Akhlus S, Doumenq P, Wong-Wah-Chung P **2017**. Beach macro-litter monitoring and floating microplastic in a coastal area of Indonesia. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 122:217–225. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.06.046
- Tanaka K, Takada H **2016**. Microplastic fragments and microbeads in digestive tracts of planktivorous fish from urban coastal waters. *Nat Publ Gr* [Internet]. 6:34351. doi:10.1038/srep34351
- Taylor ML, Gwinnett C, Robinson LF, Woodall LC **2016**. Plastic microfibre ingestion by deep-sea organisms. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 6:1–9. doi:10.1038/srep33997
- Tosetto L, Brown C, Williamson JE **2016**. Microplastics on beaches :ingestion and behavioural consequences for beachhoppers. *Mar Biol* [Internet]:163–169. <https://link-springer-com.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/article/10.1007%2Fs00227-016-2973-0>
- Tosetto L, Williamson JE, Brown C **2017**. Trophic transfer of microplastics does not affect fish personality. *Anim Behav* [Internet]. 123:159–167. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.10.035
- Tsang YY, Mak CW, Liebich C, Lam SW, Sze ET-P, Chan KM **2016**. Microplastic pollution in the marine waters and sediments of Hong Kong. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 115:20–28. doi:10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.11.003
- United Nations Environment Programme. **2017**. Marine litter socio-economic study [Internet]. Nairobi, Kenya: United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment). [https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/26014/Marinelitter\\_socioeco\\_study.pdf?sequence](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/26014/Marinelitter_socioeco_study.pdf?sequence)
- [USFDA] United States Food and Drug Administration. **2005**. The food defect action levels: levels of natural or unavoidable defects in foods that present no health hazards for humans [Internet]. [accessed 2018 Nov 30]. <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/SanitationTransportation/ucm056174.htm>
- [USFDA] United States Food and Drug Administration. **2000**. Guidance for industry: action levels for poisonous or deleterious substances in human food and animal feed [Internet]. [accessed 2017 Sep 20]. <https://www.fda.gov/Food/GuidanceRegulation/GuidanceDocumentsRegulatoryInformation/ChemicalContaminantsMetalsNaturalToxinsPesticides/ucm077969.htm#afla>
- Van Cauwenberghe L, Claessens M, Vandegehuchte MB, Janssen CR **2015**. Microplastics are taken up by mussels (*Mytilus edulis*) and lugworms (*Arenicola marina*) living in natural habitats. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 199:10–17. doi:10.1016/j.envpol.2015.01.008

- Van Cauwenberghe L, Janssen CR **2014**. Microplastics in bivalves cultured for human consumption. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 193:65–70. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2014.06.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2014.06.010)
- van der Hal N, Ariel A, Angel DL **2017**. Exceptionally high abundances of microplastics in the oligotrophic Israeli Mediterranean coastal waters. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 116:151–155. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.12.052](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.12.052)
- Van der Meulen MD, DeVriese L, Lee J, Maes T, Van Dalfsen JA, Huvet A, Soudant P, Robbens J, Vethaak A **2014**. Socio-economic impact of microplastics in the 2 seas, channel and France Manche Region: an initial risk assessment [Internet]. [place unknown]. <https://archimer.ifremer.fr/doc/00287/39834/38359.pdf>
- Vandermeersch G, Van Cauwenberghe L, Janssen CR, Marques A, Granby K, Fait G, Kotterman MJJ, Diogène J, Bekaert K, Robbens J, et al. **2015**. A critical view on microplastic quantification in aquatic organisms. *Environ Res* [Internet]. 143:46–55. doi:[10.1016/j.envres.2015.07.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2015.07.016)
- Veerasingham S, Saha M, Suneel V, Vethamony P, Rodrigues AC, Bhattacharyya S, Naik BG **2016**. Characteristics, seasonal distribution and surface degradation features of microplastic pellets along the Goa coast, India. *Chemosphere* [Internet]. 159:496–505. doi:[10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.06.056](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2016.06.056)
- Vendel AL, Bessa F, Alves VEN, Amorim ALA, Patrício J, Palma ART **2017**. Widespread microplastic ingestion by fish assemblages in tropical estuaries subjected to anthropogenic pressures. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 1–8. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.01.081](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2017.01.081)
- Volkheimer G **1977**. Persorption of particles: physiology and pharmacology. *Adv Pharmacol* [Internet]. 14:163–187. doi:[10.1016/S1054-3589\(08\)60188-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1054-3589(08)60188-X)
- von Moos N, Burkhardt-Holm P, Kohler A **2012**. Uptake and effects of microplastics on cells and tissue of the blue Mussel *Mytilus edulis* L. after an experimental exposure. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 46:11327–11335. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/es302332w>
- Ward JE, Shumway SE **2004**. Separating the grain from the chaff: particle selection in suspension- and deposit-feeding bivalves. *J Exp Mar Bio Ecol* [Internet]. 300:83–130. doi:[10.1016/j.jembe.2004.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2004.03.002)
- Wardrop P, Shimeta J, Nuggeoda D, Morrison PD, Miranda A, Tang M, Clarke BO **2016**. Chemical pollutants sorbed to ingested microbeads from personal care products accumulate in fish. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 50:4037–4044. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.5b06280>
- Watts AJR, Urbina MA, Corr S, Lewis C, Galloway TS **2015**. Ingestion of plastic microfibers by the crab *Carcinus maenas* and its effect on food consumption and energy balance. *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 49:14597–14604. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.5b04026>
- Wegner AW, Esseling EB, Oekema EMF, Amermans PK, Oelmanns AAK **2012**. Effects of nanopolystyrene on the feeding behavior of the blue mussel (*Mytilus edulis* L.). *Environ Toxicol Chem* [Internet]. 31:2490–2497. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/etc.1984>
- Wesch C, Bredimus K, Paulus M, Klein R **2016**. Towards the suitable monitoring of ingestion of microplastics by marine biota: A review. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 218:1200–1208. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2016.08.076](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.08.076)
- Wesch C, Elert AM, Wörner M, Braun U, Klein R, Paulus M **2017**. Assuring quality in microplastic monitoring: about the value of clean-air devices as essentials for verified data. *Sci Rep* [Internet]. 7:1–8. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.elib10.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1038/s41598-017-05838-4>
- Wójcik-Fudalewska D, Normant-Saremba M, Anastácio P **2016**. Occurrence of plastic debris in the stomach of the invasive crab *Eriocheir sinensis*. *MPB* [Internet]. 113:306–311. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.09.059](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.09.059)
- Wright SL, Kelly FJ **2017**. Plastic and human health: a micro issue? *Environ Sci Technol* [Internet]. 51:6634–6647. <https://pubs.acs.org/doi/10.1021/acs.est.7b00423>
- Xu X, Lee WT, Chan AKY, Lo HS, Shin PKS, Cheung SG **2017**. Microplastic ingestion reduces energy intake in the clam *Atactodea striata*. *Mar Pollut Bull* [Internet]. 124:798–802. doi:[10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.12.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.12.027)
- Yu X, Ladewig S, Bao S, Toline CA, Whitmire S, Chow AT **2018**. Occurrence and distribution of microplastics at selected coastal sites along the southeastern United States. *Sci Total Environ* [Internet]. 613–614:298–305. doi:[10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.09.100](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.09.100)
- Yu X, Peng J, Wang J, Wang K, Bao S **2016**. Occurrence of microplastics in the beach sand of the Chinese inner sea: the Bohai Sea. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 214:722–730. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2016.04.080](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.04.080)
- Zhang H **2017**. Transport of microplastics in coastal seas. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* [Internet]. 199:74–86. doi:[10.1016/j.ecss.2017.09.032](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2017.09.032)
- Zhang H, Zhou Q, Xie Z, Zhou Y, Tu C, Fu C, Mi W, Christie P, Luo Y **2017**. Occurrences of organophosphorus esters and phthalates in the microplastics from the coastal beaches in north China. *Sci Total Environ* [Internet]. 616–617:1505–1512. doi:[10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.10.163](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.10.163)
- Zhao S, Zhu L, Li D **2015**. Microplastic in three urban estuaries, China. *Environ Pollut* [Internet]. 206:597–604. doi:[10.1016/j.envpol.2015.08.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2015.08.027)
- Ziccardi LM, Edgington A, Hentz K, Kulacki KJ, Driscoll SK **2016**. Microplastics as vectors for bioaccumulation of hydrophobic organic chemicals in the marine environment: a state-of-the-science review. *Environ Toxicol Chem* [Internet]. 35:1667–1676. 3461 <http://doi-org.ezproxy.elib11.ub.unimaas.nl/10.1002/etc>